DEC 1 1927

Vol. VIII No. 8

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE FAMILY

DECEMBER
1927

ITS register of over 4,000 ex-students gives only a hint of the spread of the School's influence. The list includes, of course, influential social workers in a long catalog of communities throughout the United States. The past four years have added eighty-one students from thirty-one foreign countries. The graduate roll numbers fifteen foreign alumni from Canada, the Philippine Islands, India, Japan, Turkey, Roumania, France, and Russia.

The New York School of Social Work
107 East Twenty-second Street
New York

The University of Chicago

The Graduate School of Social Service Administration

ACADEMIC YEAR 1927–28

Autumn Quarter, October 1—December 23
Winter Quarter, January 2—March 23
Spring Quarter, April 2—June 13
Summer Quarter begins June 18, 1928

Courses leading to the degree of A.M. and Ph.D. A limited number of qualified undergraduate and unclassified students admitted.

For announcements, apply to Box 55
FACULTY EXCHANGE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

School of Social Work

Simmons College

Courses In:

Medical Social Work
Psychiatric Social Work
Family Welfare
Child Welfare
Community Work

Address

The Director

18 Somerset Street,
Boston, Massachusetts

TULANE UNIVERSITY
NEW ORLEANS

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Courses for graduate students only in

Family Social Work
Children's Case Work
Community Organization
Medical Social Work
Social Research
Vocational Guidance

Year opens September 27, 1927.

Students may also enter February 1, 1928.

Write for catalog and application blank

THE FAMILY. Published monthly, except August and September, by the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work. Publication office, 372–374 Broadway, Albany, N. Y. General office, 130 East 22d Street, New York, N. Y. Subscription, $1.50 a year; contributing subscription, $3.00; single copies, 20 cents. Entered as second class matter at the post office at Albany, N. Y., October 31, 1923, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized November 6, 1923. Copyright 1927, by the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work.

THE FAMILY

VOL. VIII | DECEMBER, 1927 | No. 8

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE CONCERN OF THE COMMUNITY WITH MARRIAGE 243
Mary E. Richmond

NEW TOOLS OF LEISURE 251
Karl de Schweinitz

THE MEANING OF THE CONFERENCE 261
Frank J. Bruno

EDITORIALS 270

REMINISCENCES OF EARLY DAYS 272

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS 274

SPIRITUAL FACTORS IN FAMILY LIFE 279
Dr. B. S. Winchester

THE VOLUNTEER—A PARADOX 281
Ellen Windom Warren Geer

THE CHANGING BASIS OF FAMILY SUPPORT AND EXPENDITURE 288
Paul H. Douglas

TOWARD THE REDISCOVERY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN INDUSTRY 295
David C. Adie

BOOK REVIEWS 301

THE CONCERN OF THE COMMUNITY WITH MARRIAGE[1]

MARY E. RICHMOND
Director, Charity Organization Department, Russell Sage Foundation

MARRIAGE, our theme today, seems to have been sharing the fate of many good melodies. Once afloat in the world, they are taken up, as a wise observer noted long ago, "by all sorts of instruments, some of them woefully coarse, feeble, or out of tune," until people are in danger of crying out that the themes and the melodies are themselves detestable. You must have often observed that human beings tend to oversimplify in this way. It saves trouble to ignore the nature of the instrument; it saves thought to pronounce this great social institution of marriage altogether good or altogether bad. And in these days of so many specialties, when life is becoming thoroughly compartmented, we are in graver danger than ever before of condemning both marriages and melodies from a too narrow, too specialized point of view.

Social reformers are apt to say, "Why doesn't the state attend to such glaring evils as these that we see all about us—the divorces, the unhappiness? What we need is a new state law." Or, as they have been taught to exclaim more recently, "What we need is an amendment to the federal Constitution." Certain of the specialists, on the other hand, are equally prompt to decide that marriage is not the state's or the nation's business at all; they are convinced that, especially where no children are involved, marital and sex relations are nobody's business but the business of the two persons concerned. The group that champions this latter conclusion has the formidable backing of Havelock Ellis, Bertrand Russell, and H. G. Wells. But Havelock Ellis is a physiological psychologist; Russell was first a mathematician though in these later days he has devoted himself to philosophy; while Wells—I don't know what Wells is, save that he is *not* an historian. All of them seem to forget that man is a social animal and that this one fact colors and to a large degree controls every one of his relationships.

When a specialist in any science comes forward to settle finally and on the basis of his own specialty a matter like this of marriage, which whatever else it may happen to be is also social, I am reminded of the comments of a columnist about a chemical convention held recently. One of the chemists at this meeting had predicted that chemistry would soon discover an antidote for fatigue poisons which would do away with sleep.

[1] Given Tuesday morning, October 4, 1927.

The columnist, after wondering what would become of the psychoanalysts, continued,

> Fifty-one weeks in the year there is no more plodding, patient, humble and incidentally underpaid member of society than the scientist in his laboratory. He measures with relentless caution. He probes with almost suicidal skepticism. . . . But when the scientist has put away his tubes, washed his hands, packed his dinner jacket and joined his fellow-scientists in annual session he lets himself go. He will glance at nothing less than a human race and concern himself with nothing less than a cosmos.

These cosmic forecasts of the biologist, the physiologist, the psychologist, the eugenicist, sometimes touch in their prophetic sweep the subject of marriage. At such times it is well to remind ourselves of the lavish gifts that science has already been able to bestow upon our modern world by its *united* approach to such a subject of outstanding importance as health, for example. When the physicians and laboratory men of a generation ago looked over the top of their professional and watertight compartments at the world outside, they discovered an intimate relation between their study and treatment of disease and the health of the nation. Thanks to their willingness to take a new point of view and to unite their efforts with those of mere laymen, things that then were the well-guarded secrets of medical practice gradually became the commonplaces of our daily living. We owe it their leaders and, in a lesser degree, to our own leaders of thirty years ago, that the great, absent-minded, unheeding public now knows something about health. Anyone who has read the *Life of Sir William Osler* must realize what a fund of common sense and wholehearted devotion went into the launching of a movement that, in its catholicity and its varieties of approach, seems to me to point the way for the community's better relation to the subject of marriage. This analogy, suggested by the united attack of the health movement, is one to which I shall wish to return a little later. I am no scientist, but I too am having a fifty-second week in my year; I too may want to claim the privilege of letting myself go to the extent of indulging for this once not only in generalization but in prophecy.

After having striven for quite a long time to pick up a few of the loose threads in one small corner of this vast subject of marriage it is a relief to be able to indulge here in one or two general statements. By contrast, therefore, with what might be termed the strictly zoölogical view of marriage, I venture the opinion that marriage always has at least four outstanding aspects: First, its strictly personal aspect; second, its family aspect; third, its community aspect; and fourth, its public or state aspect.

No one who considers what a varied and complicated thing a human being is will deny the supreme importance of the personal side, ranging as it does through body, mind, and spirit to join two unique personalities in the most intimate social relationship known to us. But this personal side of matrimony and the educational responsibility of families and kinsfolk toward their young people in preparation for it are not my subjects. You are to hear at this session from others better fitted than I am to discuss them. The state and community aspects with the boundary line between these two are going to be more than enough for my portion.

In respect of the state it would seem as true of marriage as of the melodies that are now coming to us over the air through the radio that some degree of public regulation of wave lengths and so on is necessary unless we are to have intolerably competitive discord. If there is to be any real freedom at all in marriage we must be free to give up some of that freedom in order to enjoy the rest. In the world as we know it certain social obligations are not met at all unless they are met with the help of the community as a whole acting in its collective capacity. This problem of how to make law and public administration serve human welfare in the state's relation to marriage is, as I have indicated, only one aspect of a much larger question, but it happens to be the sub-topic about which I know a little and to which the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation has been devoting attention during the last ten years. These studies are now nearing completion, but I must not attempt to summarize any of their conclusions; it would be futile to do so without giving you the findings upon which those conclusions are based. The state's part in

the marriage contract is a modest one. Few would deny, however, that it is the duty of the state to protect immaturity from exploitation through premature marriage; or that it should safeguard its citizens against downright fraud in marriage; or against compulsion and duress; or against consanguineous unions and communicable disease. The social order is actually a freer order when it has been "liberated from the encroachments and confusions of unregulated desires" to that extent. If there were time, I could also give you at least a dozen good reasons why the state should have a permanent official record of every marriage—a record made at the time the marriage takes place.

There is a distinction, however, between the community and the state. The state is only one of the organs of community—a way in which the community organizes itself, as Professor MacIver has taught us. It is not by any means the only way, of course, for the instruments of social control are not confined to municipality or nation; they are multitudinous. The many communities of which we are all members—in so far, that is, as we are capable of participation and interchange of ideas within them—can influence more intimately our ideals and our actual achievements than any generalized and codified public opinion ever does. Of course a process of redistribution of services and functions is forever going on. Certain forms of skilled treatment are taken over sooner or later by the state, while other and especially the newer forms continue to be shaped by small communities within the community and by the communities of interest that stretch far beyond it. As this communal life grows more diversified, however, there is more not only for the voluntary associations to do but for the state as well; there is more public control and there is more responsibility to be borne by each one of us and also by the host of private agencies through which our associated thinking and doing go forward.

I must hurry on without marshalling my illustrations of this. Let me take just one, however—the simplest one. What light do *early marriages* throw upon the boundary line between state and community? As one of our smaller studies, Mr. Hall and I published a book two years ago on *Child Marriages*. It seemed clear to us that the state had a part to play here in the protection of the immature, that at certain points it must supplement or even take the place of the family; while at certain other points state action must be preceded and followed by voluntary effort.

We have been keeping close watch of marriage legislation of all kinds in this country since 1920, and the number of marriage bills introduced this year was nearly double the number introduced in any other legislative year since we began our count. In 1927 there have been 138 such legislative bills of every degree of merit and the reverse. Of this number, 26 have now become laws. Without knowing the origin of every one of the 26, we do know that social workers were responsible for at least 5 of the best of them, while Leagues of Women Voters and state registrars of vital statistics also bore an important part in the legislative changes of certain states.

Pennsylvania made one of the most notable advances of the year. Under the leadership of the Public Charities Association, the social workers of that state actually were able to raise the statutory minimum marriageable age for girls from 12 to 16 years. After an unsuccessful campaign two years ago, they made studies, wrote articles, delivered speeches, and conducted the energetic campaign of education which has now ended so successfully. Minnesota has advanced her minimum from 15 to 16; New York raised hers last year from 12 to 14. This could be bettered, of course, but 12 of our states still have the 12-year minimum. Though New York's 14-year limit is still too low, the state has placed an administrative provision on the statute book this year which is probably a new one. The book on *Child Marriages* contained a whole chapter on proof of age. Following this lead, perhaps, the social workers of New York State, aided by the League of Women Voters, have procured the passage of a law that was drafted here in the city of Buffalo. It requires documentary proof of age from all candidates for marriage who are under 21. Candidates who allege they are older but appear

to the license issuer to be younger can be required to furnish evidence in much the same form now demanded by many states for the issuance of working papers.

There are a number of other possible provisions as valuable as this one but untried anywhere as yet, and we hope before long to be able to suggest these further measures to the public for consideration and possible adoption in our different states. After having watched for nearly ten years the difficulties encountered in enforcement, our recommendations are going to be conservative, but we have faith that some of them will be quite as practical as this one about proof of age. The clamor still heard in some quarters for a federal law regulating both marriage and divorce will, we believe, die down soon, for the federal measures thus far proposed would only weaken the good marriage provisions that many of our states already have without giving any adequate return whatsoever. The federal proposals are administratively unworkable.

But immaturity is only one aspect of early marriage. There is a community aspect that the state is not called upon to regulate to anything like the same degree. I refer to marriages between 20 and 25. These may still be called early, and in comparison with marriages contracted at later ages they seem eminently desirable from every point of view. As a nation, we marry earlier than we used to. The health and good comradeship of the married portion of our population has, I believe, been promoted thereby. There is, however, an unfortunate lag among the very group from whom the nation has a right to expect the most and upon whose preparation for life it has expended the most. I refer, of course, to the professional class.

When President Eliot, standing erect in the dignity and beauty of his ninety years, had addressed the distinguished assemblage in Sanders Theater that gathered there to greet him on his birthday, he also spoke outside in Harvard Yard to the College boys. He urged upon them the importance of not postponing marriage too long. "Do not wait," he urged, "till you think you can offer the girl you want to marry all the luxuries and privileges to which in her father's home she was accustomed. When you have made up your mind, give the girl a chance to tell you hers." Of course, this stated the situation at its simplest and it is far from simple, but earlier marriage for college graduates was a favorite theme of his. One wonders sometimes whether our educational standards plus our high standards of comfort and of the conventions are not a good deal to blame for what we find.

For example, two colleagues of mine took the new edition of *Who's Who* this summer and noted the age at marriage of each man among the first thousand married Ph.D.'s in the book. They found that the average age at marriage of these thousand was 29½ years, or 29.47 years to be exact. They also found that 48 per cent of the thousand married before their doctorate had been won, and that these 48 per cent actually averaged only 26¾ years at marriage. But how many children did the thousand doctors of philosophy have? All were married and all were old enough to have achieved a certain measure of distinction. Well, they averaged 1.87 children apiece. There is, however, the probability that, though all were requested to report their children, a few did not do so, and I give this figure with somewhat more hesitation than the others. But surely President Eliot was right when he said, as he often did, that college graduates had too few children. The relatively late age at marriage, if it should still hold after an analysis of all the Ph.D.'s in the book has been made, suggests the need of further investigation to discover causes and the remedy if there is one. This problem is one for the community and not for the state—more especially is it a problem for the educational community and for those in charge of professional education. If, as many educators think, we are wasting the time of students in our secondary schools, wasting several years of it, or if we are postponing the advancement and the highest earning power of the capable professional man unduly, then here are two points at which the founding of new families suffers. It has been urged by the eugenicists that the stocks assumed by them to be superior should become more productive, and that the so-called inferior stocks—usually of the poor and uneducated

—should become less so. The tests, however, that are at present suggested for dividing the sheep from the goats are so many of them far from conclusive, and the chance of improving a biological strain by adopting them is still in the present state of our knowledge so very uncertain, that the educational community would probably be on safer ground if it confined itself to a program of next steps which will increase social satisfactions and develop a sounder family life for this present generation and the next. This Conference has approached its chosen subject from that point of view. Standing outside the family and looking in upon it, it has asked itself what industry and marriage and leisure and religion were doing to help and to hinder family life today. It is from this point of view and for purposes of illustration only that I have ventured to suggest some of the state's and some of the community's relations to early marriage.

But I must not forget that this is my fifty-second week in which, instead of reporting on legislative bills that have been passed or on the statistics of Ph.D. marriages, I have a right to make some good, round, arresting prophecies. I limit myself to just one, and it is this: I prophecy that, just as the health movement has swept the country during the last twenty years, so a new social movement, a new community awakening is very nearly due. Its subject will be marriage, and to achieve social results at all comparable in value with those of the earlier movement it will have to be as many-sided in its approach, as resourceful in its attack as the making over of our health habits has been.

The physicians who shaped the health movement at its inception were wise men. They built their edifice solidly upon the foundation stones of discovery and organization. While continuing to advance steadily their standards of medical case treatment, they also labored unceasingly at research. And busy though they were, they took pains to interest the laity in their new program. Above all they recognized the importance of a form of health organization with many parts. Nothing that was essential seemed to them too small and nothing that was an obstacle was too big.

If it were possible to condense into one paragraph the main trends of this country's health developments during the last fifty years, that paragraph might suggest by analogy a possible course of development for marriage reform during the next fifty. The relation of the state to health received attention first. None of the early leaders saw the end from the beginning, nor can we, but there were great outstanding evils and possibilities at their doors and they attacked the one, developed the other. If sanitary inspection was the duty of the health wardens and if, in the New York City of those days, the health wardens were usually saloon keepers, they dealt courageously with this particular evil to the no small disgust of the wardens. When they found that many of the physicians were themselves indifferent, they organized a campaign of education among them. If an epidemic of cholera broke out in Europe, they sought the aid of the police power and of the legislature to control not only cholera and smallpox but later yellow fever as well. What they learned in their field laboratories they applied. If the liberty of the individual to acquire and to spread disease had to be interfered with, they interfered with it. And when, still later, the ravages of typhoid and of tuberculosis had centered the attention of preventive medicine upon water systems and the milk supply, upon housing and other living conditions, they did not hesitate to cross the boundary lines between state and community action and, calling upon the social workers of the country to help them, to utilize such familiar tools of our own profession as the social survey, the social exhibit, and social legislation. It was also at this stage in health developments that so much was achieved in the reform of our state and municipal health departments, and in the extension of the registration area.

But even after all this had been done, the health movement as we know it today had arrived no more than half way. It is interesting to note that topics discussed and rediscussed in the earlier proceedings of public health conventions in this country are scarcely ever mentioned now. The death rate continues to fall, however, as our health forces turn their attention more and more

to the *positive content* of health—to re-education of habit, to personal hygiene, and in these later days to mental hygiene. Though all parts of the program must still be developed and I must not seem to assume that there are no more plague spots for the sanitarians to clear up, the more detailed, man-to-man procedures will probably receive the larger share of our attention from now on. It is evident, however, first that no one step in the long journey could have been dispensed with; and second that every vital aspect of modern life and almost every possible form of community organization has been swept into the health advance at one or another stage of its increasing momentum.

Are we not facing today another and equally important set of social conditions—conditions surrounding the founding of new families that at some points are quite as unhappy as the health situation of fifty years ago? Look around you if you doubt it; and a courage just as high, a willingness to study, to confer, to act with a like degree of humility must be ours today, if we are to do more than play at being socially minded. The line of development may not take the same course, but I suspect that it will have to. Even if we would, we cannot escape the community aspects of this subject of marriage. Though its more personal side is of vital importance too, the right of the individual to ignore social welfare is a self-destroying right.

It is time now that we asked ourselves—assuming that a new and separate movement for saner, more truly permanent, more socially successful marriage is soon to get under way—what elements in the community are likely to bear an important part in it. Health will bear an essential but not a leading part, I believe. Just as the physicians were foreordained leaders in the conquest of disease, so in a marriage reform movement leadership will probably belong, in the earlier stages at least, to some of those who are already responsible for our formulated marriage policies. These are the legal fraternity, the clergy, the lawmakers, the administrators of the marriage law, the women's organizations of the country, certain of the scientists, and the social workers. I do not pretend to know which one of these groups will be the dominant factor in marriage reform, but each group has something to contribute that the others have not. Historically, the law and the church have borne leading parts in helping to shape our marriage customs. Their increasing recognition of the value of the laity's point of view in other connections encourages one to believe that they will abandon any closely compartmented procedures in relation to marriage also.

The general public does not yet realize what advances in the art of noting the actual happenings to clients, plaintiffs, and defendants have been made of late by the legal profession and the faculties of our law schools. To name only one instance, a study is now being made, under the leadership of Dean Pound and some of his colleagues, of the courts of Boston. Social workers and others familiar with the life of the city of Boston have been given ample opportunity to contribute their concrete experiences. Five years ago I had occasion to quote to family social workers a statement of Dean Pound's which applies not only to his specialty and to ours but to the problems of marriage as well. He said, "At whatever cost in dramatic interest or satisfied simplicity of plan, we must insist on plurality of causes and plurality of remedies." We must indeed. Many failures in marriage legislation and marriage law enforcement in the past are traceable to a combination of rigid tradition with simplicity of plan.

The churches are also beginning to recognize the importance of plurality of causes and of remedies. Recently the Federal Council of Churches appointed a commission to study the subjects of marriage and divorce. This Commission is taking the word "study" seriously, and is seeking co-operative relations with bodies made up of laymen interested in the subject.

Bearing a relation to both church and state, it is estimated that there are about 130,000 clergymen in this country who are empowered to officiate at marriages. Here we have a small army. If we add to these ministers not only the 30,000 civil officiants at marriages but the 7,650 lawmakers who are empowered to pass state marriage laws, and the more than 10,000 marriage license

issuers (including their deputies), we have nearly 178,000 of our representatives who are in a position to interpret the state's intent—your intent and my intent—to the citizens of the United States who are about to marry. I have had occasion to know something of the powers and the predispositions of some of this large body of public servants. Heretofore their unrelated activities in the marriage field have been nobody's business in particular, but what has already been done to improve the state's relation to health can also be done to improve its relation to marriage. Many of the 178,000, seeing more than we do of the present somewhat chaotic conditions, are eager to help.

As soon as a movement for marriage reform gets well under way, another factor in it—a much newer one than those already named—will be the women's organizations of the country. No one has ever accused me of being an advanced feminist, but to study the history of marriage legislation is to become convinced that there has been a good deal of very stupid, man-made law on the subject of marriage. Heaven forbid that it should be followed by a lot of woman-made law! What we need, of course, is a reconciliation and fusion of the two points of view.

There is going to be no neglect, I trust, of the special sciences that can throw light upon our subject. Though marriage reform will not have so much to learn from science as did health reform, we should be eager to profit by all that biology, anthropology, eugenics, and psychology have to teach us. If there is any science that can help us to be wiser, less credulous, and less sensational in our use of vital statistics, I hope that science will begin to deal with us very soon. The statistics of marriage and divorce seem to present many temptations to the sensation-mongers.

In this incomplete enumeration of the different communities and professions that may be interested in a movement for marriage reform, it would be foolish to assume any high degree of unanimity among them at the initial stage. There may be sharp differences of opinion at first. But, to quote Whitehead, "a clash of doctrines is not a disaster—it is an opportunity." If it stimulates us to study harder and fires us with a desire to examine all the evidence instead of any particular part of it only, the clash will do us good.

A friend of mine who often reads my manuscripts and gives me the benefit of criticisms sometimes tart and always tonic has said of this paper that it takes altogether for granted, and so does not attempt to prove, that marriage is a good thing. I have defended myself by quoting Mr. Folks' dictum of years ago that the people who then came to lecture at schools of social work always began with Adam and made it difficult by so doing to get forward with the subject in hand. It is true that, by and large, I am assuming marriage to be a good thing, just as I am also assuming disease to be a bad thing. But a number of people are so far from thinking disease a bad thing that they deny its existence altogether. Their mistaken attitude has given the health movement a world of trouble; so will the attitudes of certain groups toward marriage, but these need not deflect our attention from our goal.

Our ultimate goal, I take it, is the one suggested by Mr. Bruno several years ago at a National Conference of Social Work when he said, "We must help to transform a society which has controlled its behavior by tradition into one which controls it by intelligent choice." That statement has seemed to me the keynote of all this series of meetings. The intelligent choices controlling marriage have many of them still to be discovered, but the interest in the subject today as a social problem of commanding importance encourages one to hope that not too much time will be wasted in such theoretical and inconclusive speculations as we have just had in the Keyserling book on marriage, for example. What we need is a series of next steps, however short. It is through proceeding to take such steps, in fact, that discovery is made possible.

You may be asking, "But where do the social workers, and especially the family social workers come in in all this?" I have saved them for the very end, and it is here, unfortunately, where I am most deeply involved, that my gift of prophecy is most likely to fail me. Our best beginning, probably, is to begin where we are. The editor

of the Association Press said recently, "Humanity is so passionately sure that some new social device will get us out of the present crisis in marriage that it is almost impossible to secure any consideration for an attempt to work the means that we possess." Beginning where we are involves making the best possible use of our case work experience and improving both the background and the foreground of our records when they deal, as they often do, with marital difficulties. But we should not stop here. It is true that the small group and the individual aspects concern social case workers most nearly, but if there had been time I think I could have convinced you that the successive steps by which I was drawn into the administrative studies that my colleagues and I have been making were all social case work steps. As between social reform and social case work, in fact, there is no "either or" situation but a "both" situation always. Everything said by Miss Hamilton two days ago at this Conference is so profoundly true that it seems to me to establish a social work landmark, but my topic today happens to be the other side of our program.

Social advance is a unit, and if we study our case work failures carefully we are only too likely to find that even the most painstaking case treatment often breaks down at the very point where another community resource or group of resources touches the lives of our clients vitally. Unless, therefore, we are able, while remaining loyally devoted to our own specialty, to work from the basis of the whole and to see the multiform inter-relations of the whole, we are in grave danger of making the mistake that the French physicians made when they objected to Pasteur's revolutionary discoveries because their concern, as doctors, was not with the disease but with the individual patient.

In any new social reform, social case work is likely to come in at two important stages. It precedes the large concerted movements and prepares the way for them by bearing faithful witness to the pressure of bad conditions upon individuals and families. But later, it is equally serviceable in applying the new legislative and administrative measures in detail; especially in the initial stages can it bear an important part in helping to make these new measures workable.

If I were going on a long journey and not likely to come back, I think my very last words to my colleagues in family social work, with whom I have had so many good times, would be these: Study and develop your work at its point of intersection with the other services and social activities of your community. Learn to do your daily tasks not any less thoroughly, but to do them from the basis of the whole and with that background always in mind. After all, society is one fabric, and when you know the resources of your community both public and private, and the main trends of its life rather than any particular small section of it, you are able to knit into the pattern of that fabric the threads of your own specialty. There are eddies and flurries, not to say crazes. Disregard them and let your minds carry through to the practical next steps by which genuine social advance is achieved.

In this matter of marriage—and no larger question, as it seems to me, is likely to demand your attention during the next fifty years—bear faithful, unsensational witness to what is happening in your own state. Instead of seeking any comprehensive, all-at-once remedy either through national or state action, be content at first with short next steps carefully taken and well secured by good enforcement. Work with the administrators of the marriage law, try to understand their difficulties. You ought to find it easy, for some of theirs are yours too. And yet again, and now finally, consider what a wonderfully varied and constructive part is going to be borne later in all this by the many different associations and forms of community that constitute our free society. The goal is so great a one! Prepare yourselves to contribute your characteristic difference to that common stock of insights through which—without a thought of who is to get the credit—there is finally to be achieved as great an advance in marriage reform as we are now achieving in the field of public health.

NEW TOOLS OF LEISURE[1]

KARL DE SCHWEINITZ
General Secretary, Philadelphia Family Society

THIS generation may yet attain to the leisure of Utopia. Even now we are at its very threshold.

"For they . . . assign only six hours to work, three before noon, upon the which they go straight to dinner; and after dinner, when they have rested two hours, then they work three hours and upon that they go to supper."

Sir Thomas More no longer sounds Utopian. His working day—nine in the morning to five in the afternoon—would scarcely seem startling in a modern office, and we can almost match his additional hour of rest at noon with our short Saturday and our summer holidays. Industry is completing the victory of the eight-hour standard and experiments with the five-day week indicate the direction of future progress. The same generation which has achieved the submarine of Jules Verne and which sends music over the air beyond the dreams of *Looking Backward* is now on the way toward realizing a leisure that centuries have held to be one of the impossibilities of a visionary island.

During nearly all of the four hundred years since the publication of *Utopia,* the world continued living under the influence of an agricultural régime in which work lasted from sunrise or earlier to sunset or later. Then in the memory of our own times came the great change. Industry displaced farming as a standardizing factor. For hundreds of thousands of people the hours of labor were reduced by fully a third, and for the first time in history leisure became a settled part of the life of a whole nation.

It was an experience for which we were unprepared. We did not enter upon the new régime at one step. We have arrived gradually, occupation by occupation, and we are still consolidating our gains. It has been difficult for us to appreciate the implications of what has happened, the more so because there is little that the past can offer us by way of suggestion. Never before have blocks of time been isolated from the day and set apart from work for the profit of everybody.

[1] Given Monday evening, October 3, 1927.

The leisure class, to be sure, has been a familiar phenomenon, but however much its fortune has been envied its use of that fortune has seldom been regarded as worthy of emulation. Often, indeed, it has been a cause of social upheaval. How large a factor in such movements as the early Christian Church, the Reformation, Puritanism, and the French Revolution, was protest against the morals of the time, disapproval of the way in which the leisure class was spending its leisure? Its failure as a class in the use of its leisure has prevented us from profiting by the successes of its individuals.

When we entered upon our new working régime the universal conception of leisure was rest. Hitherto the hours of labor had been so long that at the end of the day the laborer was chiefly conscious of his weariness. The human race like Mr. Pickwick's cabhorse had been borne up so very tight and taken in so very short that it had been quite ready to fall down when released from harness. We were too tired to think of anything but rest.

Rest, through all the ages, has been looked forward to as the great boon. "There the wicked cease from troubling and there the weary are at rest." The New Testament in one of its most comforting passages offers rest to all that "labor and are heavy laden," while Milton describes the fallen angels as being in "regions of sorrow, doleful shades where peace and rest can never dwell." Rest, surcease from labor, release from work—that to mankind has in itself been an end. It was this that gave the Blessed Isles their classic charm.

They till not the ground, they plow not the wave,
They labor not, never, oh never!
Not a tear do they shed, not a sigh do they heave,
They are happy for ever and ever.

Philosophically this conception of leisure as rest continued down to the present generation. In practice, however, rest frequently degenerated into idling. The loafer became an evident part of the life of every community—not merely the professional loafer who never worked but the man who had nothing to do when work was done. As

industry increased its concentration of population, the groups of men and boys lounging at the end of the day in front of the post office, before the livery stable and the grocery store, and on street corners became larger.

They were recognized as a problem but not so much because of their loafing as because they were violating an essential part of our philosophy of leisure.

Leisure when defined as rest meant rest at home. Our ideal was the Cotter's Saturday night; our favorite picture, that of the workman lifting at evening the latch of the gate in the whitewashed picket fence while at the open door in the white cottage at the end of the path stand wife and children waiting to welcome him. This was the goal of leisure—rest with the family at home.

We therefore failed to appreciate the presence of another problem that, while less obtrusive than the loafing on street corners, was just as stultifying. This was the idling at home that reached its most visible expression on the front porch.

When this adult generation was young no house was completely furnished which, in addition to its rocking chairs, did not have pillows and cushions for those who sat on the front steps. Here, the day's work done, the young women in their best dresses would establish themselves, waiting to receive their friends of both sexes or to sally forth upon a visit to a neighboring porch. In this they were controlled by custom rather than by the prospect of pleasure. The same people who would meet today had been together yesterday. Nothing new had happened in the interval. There were no new ideas, and conversation frequently degenerated into critical remarks about absent ones interspersed with petty teasings and gigglings.

This front porch idling reached its worst when the young people gathered on Sunday afternoon, stodgy from a dinner heavier than those during the week and cramped from the restraint of church, Sunday-school, and Sunday clothes. All the varieties of walks possible to a Sunday had been exhausted and there was nothing to do but sit about together in mutual and unrelieved boredom.

As we look back to the romance of childhood and youth and the adventures we had and the good times we experienced we recall most readily the things we did. We are less likely to recollect the hours when we did nothing, yet in them was the problem of leisure.

This problem might have become serious to the point of recognition if the machine which was increasing our leisure had not also begun to supply us with tools for enjoying it. The bicycle, the phonograph, the player piano, the automobile, the motion picture, and later the radio, came to us just as we were reaching saturation so far as idleness was concerned. Undoubtedly they have saved leisure from becoming a menace, but in doing this they have run counter to our philosophy and so we regard them with suspicion.

As we see the Sunday procession of automobiles on the highways and as in the evenings we watch the crowds thronging the motion picture houses we repeat the familiar formula—the American people are always on the go and they are never at home. We are so disturbed at the manner in which our doctrine of leisure seems to be disregarded that we are unable to control our anxiety long enough to examine the facts. Actually, it is a question whether people are away from their families or even from their homes as much as they were in the days before our acquisition of leisure.

Of all recreation the motion picture is most frequently accused of taking us from home. There are approximately 163,000 seats in the motion picture theaters of Philadelphia.[2] Motion picture distributors estimate daily attendance at twice seating capacity. That would be for Philadelphia 326,000. The city's population of school age or older is estimated at a little less than 1,800,000.[3] This means that, on an average, each person in Philadelphia visits a motion picture house once every five-and-a-half days, a ratio in agreement with estimates of attendance throughout the United States.

From 1907 to 1924 the unionized trades reporting to the United States Bureau of Labor showed an average reduction in hours of 8.7 per cent. This is equivalent to an increase in leisure of more than four hours

[2] Official estimate.

[3] The statistical data in this paper have been compiled by William J. Deeney, Research Secretary of the Family Society of Philadelphia.

a week, enough to make possible weekly attendance at two motion picture shows of the usual two hours each without decreasing the time the wage earner formerly spent with the family. But this is only part of the story. It does not take into consideration decreases in hours achieved prior to 1907 in many industries. Moreover it is an average by occupations in which an occupation with one hundred men would have equal value with one of ten thousand.

In certain occupations leisure has increased far above this average. In 1914 there were 50,726 employees in establishments in the men's clothing industry reporting to the United States Bureau of Labor who had a working week of 54 hours or more. In 1923 there were only 4,440 employees with a week of 54 hours or more. In 1914 there were 35,114 employees working 48 hours or less. In 1923, 172,077 were working 48 hours or less, of whom 142,815 were working 44 hours or less.[4] Tens of thousands of workers in this industry have thus had ten hours or more added to their leisure. They can visit five motion picture shows a week and still be with their families as much as they were in 1914.

Milkmen in San Francisco have recently won the eight-hour day.[5] They go to work at 7 o'clock in the morning and stop at 3:30 in the afternoon. Modern methods of refrigeration have made it possible for the driver of a milk wagon to do his work in the day time; thereafter to go to a motion picture show, and still get home in time for dinner. Even more dramatic is the addition to the leisure of the employees of the United States Steel Corporation.[6] Fully 70,000 of these workers can now go to two motion picture shows a day and still have more time with their families than they had prior to 1923.

Professional baseball has been accused of taking men from home. The total attendance at the seven games of the World's Series last year was 328,051.[7] In 1919, when prohibition went into effect, there were 1,800 saloons in Philadelphia.[8] If each saloon had had a daily average of only 26 men who stayed for a succession of drinks, the combined saloon population for seven days would have exceeded the largest World's Series attendance in the history of baseball.

As a pleasure vehicle the automobile is distinctly a week-end and pleasant evening machine. It is a family conveyance, parents and children using it together. Instead of sitting on the front steps, with "Goswell Street at their feet, Goswell Street on the right hand, and Goswell Street on the left," they sit in an automobile and see country that was as unexplored Africa to them a few years ago.

Leisure has increased beyond the time needed for the tools that must be used away from the house, and many of the new tools are only substituting for old ones that have been discarded. In addition there are attractions to keep us at home that did not exist when we were born. There has yet to be published the biography of a successful man in the last generation which does not tell how his books were limited to a scant half-dozen. In 1926, the Philadelphia Public Library circulated 4,099,977 books,[9] the New York Library 9,411,167 books,[10] while in 1923 the number of published books and pamphlets circulated in the United States was 359,391,016.[11] In 1884 there were 2,988 libraries with one thousand volumes or more in the United States. In 1923 there were 8,544.[12] Reading is largely a home occupation.

The care of the home one owns is an absorbing interest and pleasure for the householder and tends to keep him within the bounds of his own property. In 1920, 10,866,960 families in the United States owned their own homes[13] and this was before the recent wave of home ownership had reached its peak.

The player piano and the phonograph have been factors in adding to the pleasures of home. Recently they have in interest, if not in number, been eclipsed by radio. It is estimated that there are six million radio

[4] Statistical Abstract of the United States.
[5] *Monthly Labor Review*, February, 1927.
[6] *Labor Policy of the United States Steel Corporation:* Gulick.
[7] *World Almanac*, 1927.
[8] Clerk of the Court of Quarter Sessions, Philadelphia County.
[9] Official figures, Philadelphia Free Library.
[10] Official figures, Public Library, City of New York.
[11] U. S. Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce.
[12] U. S. Bureau of Education.
[13] Bureau of Census.

sets in the United States [14] and the number is growing daily.

There should be added to these considerations the increase that has taken place in the leisure of children and young people. The National Child Labor Committee started in 1902. Before that in many states there was no legal age at which children were too young to work. In 1890 there were approximately 200,000 pupils in the high schools of the United States. There are now nearly 4,000,000. The various vacation periods give these students vastly more leisure than did the strict routine of industry.

Women in industry have profited in recreational opportunity along with men. Women at home have gained more time for themselves through the use of inventions and the help of manufactured products. The housewife may be out and about more than formerly, but shall we say that she and her family are not better off than when baking and canning and manual labor made the home chiefly a workshop rather than a tool of leisure to be enjoyed with husband and children? In the good old days the man came home to rest. This was his masculine privilege. His wife might meet him at the door to add to the joy of his home coming, but straightway she returned to her labor and there was little opportunity for them to recreate together. Today the burden of proof rests upon those who feel that the new tools of leisure are reducing the hours that the members of families spend with each other. Has not the time come for an inquiry into the whole theory of rest at home as the goal of leisure and for study to determine in the light of new experience what leisure really involves?

Any such inquiry would immediately reveal that many of the highest joys of leisure are solitary. One must preferably be alone to meditate. One must usually be alone to create, certainly in writing and in musical composition and quite frequently in drawing and painting. Reading that tends toward study needs to be free from interruption. To walk solitarily, to be alone in an observatory with a telescope, to browse among old volumes in a library is to violate both the principle of rest and that of association with one's family, and yet who will deny the delight to be had in these ways.

It is quality of association much more than quantity that produces the greatest returns in happiness at home. The most precious memories we have of our parents are those often of comparatively brief periods of fellowship. We may derive our sense of security with our mother's milk and from the tender daily care she gives us during infancy and childhood, but an hour of tennis will create more satisfaction in adolescence than a day of meaningless being together. Granted that hours of contact with paternal example, unconsciously though nevertheless closely observed, may influence a whole career, yet they will be dim compared with the shining ten minutes when one's father first read aloud:

The Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold,
And his cohorts were gleaming in yellow and gold,
And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea,
When the blue wave rolls nightly on deep Galilee.

It is what each member contributes to the family that makes the life of the home. The family cannot exist of and by itself. It is dependent upon experience and the closest interplay between itself and the world outside. The family that huddles together on the front steps is safe, but how stultifying is its leisure. Only as parents and children go forth adventuring—and there is fully as much adventure in an hour with a microscope as in an hour at the north pole—can they bring back to each other the variety and the interest that makes of comradeship a recreation.

This does not preclude doing things together away from home. Home is where the family is, not necessarily where the house is. Home can be in the drawing room of a pullman, in an automobile or in a tent in the woods. People not materials make the home.

Grant these four principles—that many of our highest joys are solitary, that quality of association is more potent than quantity, that the family is as dependent upon the experience of its members as living creatures are upon food, and that home is where the family is—grant these four things and the bogy of rest at home will yield to a new and more dynamic conception of leisure.

[14] Willis Kingsley Wing, Editor, *Radio Broadcast.*

Leisure is the time we have to do what we want to do. It will include rest. It may include rest at home. Today we are making large use of it in exercising our faculties of appreciation. We are continually being invited to do this by the new tools of leisure, both those which have come to us as the product of the machine and those which are the result of commercial and civic activity. We listen to the phonograph, the player piano, the radio. We see the motion picture, the baseball game, the football game, the tennis match. We visit art galleries and attend symphony concerts and the theater. In all this many people find great occasion for concern. They feel that we are passive, that we are entertained instead of entertaining, that we are degenerating because we watch sports when we ought to be engaging in them ourselves.

Such people are right in fearing overemphasis of passive entertainment but the remedy is not in a reduction of opportunities now offered but in the improvement of them and in the finding of other tools of leisure. There is also need for recognition of the value of the appreciative faculties and the manner in which they tend to seek ever finer mediums. The development of music in the United States is encouraging testimony to this fact, not merely in the quality of our symphony orchestras, but in the better character of the music to be heard in the motion picture theaters and through the radio. Nor is there occasion to feel discouragement at the interest in watching sports. It has yet to be proven, in the face of rapidly increasing municipal and private provision for recreation, that individual participation is decreasing. Moreover, sport as a spectacle is not by any means a stupid watching of other people work. There is a close kinship between the fan and the art connoisseur. The same fundamental appreciation of beauty is present in both. The dispatch with which the baseball player handles the ball, the swing of the bat, the arc of the flight, the tennis player's timing of stroke and step, all reveal a rhythm and a grace that the artist can only attempt to copy, while in the analysis of strategy the spectator finds a keen and exhilarating mental exercise.

The motion picture has yet to achieve the beauty that music and sport can offer. In truth, in dramatic unity, in composition, it has not matched the quality of its photography. It would almost seem as if the appreciative faculties that deal with music, with line, and with rhythm are capable of a speedier and more general education than those which have to do with structure and with the beauties of artistic conception. In these latter aspects, is it not possible that the motion picture has a much closer and more fundamental relation to literature than we have hitherto realized? There is need for someone to recognize in it the same opportunity for popular education that Walter Damrosch has perceived in radio. Why should not the theater guild and the little theater idea be applied here? The motion picture today is the most generally available tool for the exercise of the appreciative faculties. If not the adults, at least the children who throng to it only to be debauched by excitement should have the best that art can offer. Those who feel a concern for the quality of our use of leisure would do well to turn their attention in this direction.

Despite all the emphasis upon commercial entertainment it is by no means certain that, as many people fear, we are losing interest in creative effort. It is a question whether appreciation of another's skill does not arouse the desire for emulation. Hundreds of thousands of people attend athletic contests but is it not because of this interest that it has been possible for municipalities to develop public golf courses, tennis courts, swimming pools, and recreation centers? Certainly, the average player, to whom sport is an activity of leisure, is more skilful and more graceful in performance today than he was a few years ago.

When the boys of this generation learned to swim they were for the most part satisfied if they could propel themselves into and through the water. They used the swimming hole, often despite parental disapproval and usually without parental interest or support. Today both boys and girls are encouraged to go to the swimming pool and they are no longer content with the crudities that passed with us. Efficiency in stroke and form in diving are cultivated, and there has

been a great achievement in beauty and in skill.

The same development has taken place in tennis. Courts no longer have a ground hazard and the players are not satisfied merely with the capture of a match. They care about the quality of the strokes with which they win, and here, too, as also in golf, the girl has left the idleness of the front porch for the practice of an athletic art.

We have yet to realize the opportunity that dancing offers for the expression of beauty and grace. We have thought of dancing too much in terms of the relation between the sexes. Our civic efforts have been to regulate and supervise, to see that dancing is proper. We have been concerned too little with the art of the dance and such interest as we have felt has been segregated among the comparatively few persons who are prepared to practice the rhythmic and the interpretative dance and the slightly larger number who have engaged in folk dancing.

There should be emphasis upon skill and beauty in those forms of dancing—namely the fox trot and the waltz and their various derivatives—in which the majority of people who dance participate. Little is being done to cultivate art here. Most of the dancing classes which are organized for children as a form of social equipment do not teach much more than the steps. Once these are acquired the class is merely a vehicle for bringing the young people together.

The same spirit and attitude that characterizes our approach to sport should be applied to developing form in the common varieties of the dance. They should be included as part of the athletic curriculum of the school. They should have their place along with the drills and marches in gymnastic exhibitions. Let art be emphasized and not only will these dances be executed more beautifully but there will develop out of them interest in the rhythms which afford greater opportunity for the expression of grace and skill.

Of the three arts, conventionally and most generally recognized as creative—writing, drawing, and music—writing is least often exploited as an activity of leisure. For the most part, people either write as a career or they do not write at all, and when they write as a career, whether vocationally or avocationally, they do so as a means of professional or economic advancement. Writing becomes a chore, even though frequently a pleasant one.

Writing today is the result of a process of selection, for only the most hardy and self-convinced authors can survive an educational system which too often chokes the interest of its children with grammatical definition and literary exercise. Unfortunately, those who live through this experience almost inevitably become infected with the ideals of an environment which, whatever it may intend, has the ultimate effect of implying that training in the art of writing means preparation *to write*. Thus many people with ability enough to give pleasure to themselves and possibly even to their friends are graduated with the belief that they must make writing their career, and what might have been a source of happiness during leisure becomes a thwarting influence in the finding of a vocation.

If the art of letter-writing seems to have been abandoned it is because those who might practice it either have never been educated to its delights or are spending all their time in professional effort. If place cards are bought and not made at home and if the charming custom of writing verse on family anniversaries and like occasions is seldom met with it is largely because children soon learn that poetry is one of the things one has to do for school, as such being subject to rule and regulation, and that the composing of verse at any other time is an admission of one's desire to take place beside Shakespeare and the other immortals.

Many interesting though isolated attempts are being made to encourage early efforts at self-expression through writing, but the real hope for this aspect of leisure lies in the willingness of the schools to emancipate writing from grammatical formulism on the one hand and from literary implication on the other, so that it may develop naturally and spontaneously as a tool to be modified by each individual in accordance with his personality and his needs.

However ideal the conditions under which writing may be taught, it is not likely ever to have so general an appeal as music and the graphic arts. The movement to encour-

age the development of creative skill in both these fields has made great headway and in this the settlement and the school have played an important part. The revival of the woodcut, and the increase of interest in etching is by no means limited to the professional artist and the number of amateurs now painting pictures is large. Why should there not then be a general return to mural decoration wherein as an activity of leisure some appropriately gifted member of the family would use the walls of the home as his canvas; and why should we not make our own Christmas cards?

As in writing, so in music and the graphic arts, the greatest hindrance to the development of recreational tools is the tendency toward professionalism. Let an individual exhibit a moderate skill and he desires instantly to commercialize it. The young woman who sings must enter the operatic field. The boy who sketches must become an illustrator. As an antidote there should be constant repetition of the art-for-art's-sake motif.

The schools of correspondence and the extension departments of universities have tended to foster the commercialization of culture not only in art but in all departments of knowledge. There is too much evaluation of education in terms of the ten-thousand-dollar job. The night school beckons the student with the promise of making an executive out of a clerk. It says little about learning for the sake of finding out, yet there is abundant testimony to the large number of people who pursue discovery for its own sake.

There are 17,000 amateur radio broadcasters in the United States, and, it is estimated, 300,000 non-professional persons who have a practical knowledge of radio.[15]

Does not their work contain the suggestion for a most satisfying use of leisure, namely activity in the sciences? The schools and universities should invite to their laboratories those who would like to learn more of the world about them. Why should not the telescope, the microscope, and the test tube be made available to those whose interest in science is not colored by utilitarian visions of additional income or a Ph.D. degree, and why should not chemistry, biology, astronomy, physics, be made as attractive for amateur experiment as radio has been? There is nothing so tragic in the life of our secondary schools as the way in which the interest inherent in such studies as geography and physiology is choked by the cataloguing of cities and the memorizing of bones; and how barren of all inspiration is that extension of pedagogic despotism so appropriately named home work.

The school, along with such organizations as the boy scouts and the girl scouts, has made a great contribution to leisure by fostering the study of the wild life of the woods and fields. Today there are thousands of city children who know vastly more about birds and flowers than did the country children of a generation ago. The growth of municipal, state, and federal park systems has given great opportunity for this type of recreation. The example of cities like New York and Chicago, which have acquired park lands outside of city territory where people can camp and live a back to nature life should be more generally followed so that every large community might have within twenty or thirty miles of its boundaries a wide acreage devoted to wood and stream and wild life for the use and appreciation of its citizens.

Trails such as the Green Mountain Club and the Appalachian Mountain Club have developed in Vermont and New Hampshire should be laid in every state in the union, a task that might appropriately be assigned to the departments of forestry. The automobile has made the highway unpleasant to the hiker and part of the revenue from motor cars might appropriately be used in the making of byways for the walker, byways with shelters at convenient intervals where the traveler may camp for the night. Walking will lure men so long as it contains the possibility of adventure with nature. The open road has been taken from them. Let them have the path through the woods.

We need opportunity not only to discover but also to reflect. Our catalogue of facts is steadily increasing. Our store of food for thought grows greater every day. We need to assimilate and absorb. We need to wonder and to worship, yet in these bustling times we know little of the art of meditation.

[15] Willis Kingsley Wing, Editor, *Radio Broadcast.*

This is peculiarly the province and opportunity of the church. There should be experimentation with the kinds of service that may best foster reflection. There should be deliberate effort to cultivate the art of meditation as, for example, has been done by the Society of Friends and in certain of the retreats of the Roman Catholic Church.

The home also has its responsibility. Wherever possible the household should be organized in such a way that at times some room may be available for thought. Those families which are able to reserve a room for guests might in the intervals between hospitality use it as a place for reflection.

This use of a guest room is more possible than it would have been a generation ago, for our friends do not visit us as much as they did. The art of fellowship has not been aided by the development of the machine. It would seem almost as if the very means of communication that we thought would bring us together have tended to isolate us from each other. The days when the man walked to work talking pleasantly with his friends and when the woman knew her neighbors are passing. Now the man does not speak to his seat-mate on train or electric car and feels hurt if he is interrupted in the reading of his paper. Often he commutes to work alone in his motor-car. No longer do we choose our friends from among our neighbors. We pick them here and there over an area of twenty miles. There is a corresponding loss in the friendliness that goes with informality. Even the children must see each other by appointment. To visit our friends is more of an effort than it used to be when we lived next door, and so often we use the telephone instead.

A generation ago the family was always ready at a moment to entertain unexpected visitors and there was always an ample store of jellies and provisions against such a contingency. Now friends would not think of inviting themselves for dinner. Herein we are losing one of the richest joys of leisure. We need a revival of the art of hospitality and, most specifically, of the art of informal dining. It is an art which the distance separating us from each other makes desirable and which the revolution in our eating habits makes especially interesting. There is a daintiness about the modern table that is as vastly more attractive than the heavily laden and bounteous courses of the past as the thin, delicious sandwich of today is superior to its thick substantial forerunner of a generation ago. Skill can reduce the expense of hospitality and variety of experience can make its conversation more interesting.

Entertainment should as often and as much as possible be a family affair. The children should be included. There is no experience in the home so exciting or so interesting to a child as the across-the-table talk of guests and hosts. It opens many doors to the world outside and it reveals his parents in a new light as he sees them through the eyes of their peers—and if he feels that he too can have his place in the conversation and be a participant, not merely an observer, he finds a new thrill of kinship with the family that he had not sensed before.

Conversation at table should always be one of the delights of leisure, the more delightful because along with the art of cooking and serving food, it takes time devoted to the necessity of eating and makes of it a pleasure. Dinner is the great meeting place of the family, affording opportunity for each member to set forth the observations, the experiences, and the jokes of the day—most especially the jokes—for joking and laughter bring the generations together as few other things can.

That, too, is one of the values in the playing of games. Aside from their inherent fun they furnish a common ground for parents and children. We are all of an age when we face each other in doubles at ping-pong with one bat to a side—while, despite the manner in which bridge is often abused, it provides nevertheless one of the most satisfactory occasions for the meeting of the two generations. Exceptionally fortunate, also, is he who can join in hop-scotch, in kicking football, or catching baseball—now played alike by boys and girls—for he has the double advantage of a good time for himself and a comradeship with his children.

Collecting is another game to which all can contribute and where all are brought closer together. It may be butterflies, it may be stamps, it may be tinfoil, it may be books, but whatever it is the family will be drawn in as to a vortex, even as the grand-

mother of three score and ten who suddenly found herself holding up traffic when in a moment of absorbed triumph she stooped while crossing the busy avenue to pick up the prize cigar band for her grandson's collection.

The perfection of comradeship can never be achieved between the generations. The difference in age, in experience, and in the times cannot be bridged, and whoever builds his life upon too close a fellowship of this type must either be disappointed or create a relationship that is artificial and pregnant with unhappiness.

The fellowship that offers most in understanding and in appreciation is that between the parents themselves. As the hours of leisure have increased, the time that husband and wife may and do spend with each other has also increased. Equal opportunity for education through the school has helped them toward a common intellectual footing and the new tools of leisure that commerce has supplied are essentially mutual in their appeal and use. Contrast the separation from the family which the saloon fostered with the companionship that is had in attendance at the motion picture show or in the automobile. In the absence of appropriate facts it is impossible to analyze the significance of the decrease in commercialized vice referred to, for instance, in *Does Prohibition Work?* but it is difficult to believe that the presence of the ancient evil has not through all time helped to besmirch the whole sex relationship and to surround the physical union in marriage with a furtive and dubious atmosphere.

We are fast emancipating ourselves from the tyranny of the obscene. That which each individual hid within himself as his shame is now being recognized as a common heritage, rich with possibilities of happiness. Man is no longer sole custodian of the mysteries. The prerogative of sophistication has been wrested from him. Woman demands the right to share with him the whole range of life. A mutuality of interest has developed which has given new content to marriage and a wider area of fellowship.

But the emotional life is greater than any of the sources from which it springs and the whole edifice of marriage cannot be built upon a single foundation. There is no aspect of love which is a panacea. There is no one key to the art of living. The fellowship between man and wife is the ripening of interest and shared experience quickened both by the hour of noon and by the mellowing sun of appreciation and understanding.

Inspiring and satisfying though such a fellowship may be, especially when accompanied by the comradeship of parents and children, the fullest use of leisure will include a wider kinship. The life of the family, being dependent for its complete expression upon a free interplay with the world outside, has a vast stake in the common good. Activity toward the advancement of the universal welfare should form part of the leisure of everybody. If this is a social responsibility that to some may seem far removed from anything that savors of recreation it is nevertheless full of opportunity for the exercise of the very skills and explorations that are a goal of leisure. Nowhere else is there such scope for the practice of the art of human association or for the sort of discovery that gives one fuller appreciation of human character and life. Social service is a duty that can be sublimated into one of the great happinesses of leisure.

Even work can assume the quality of freedom that characterizes recreation. For a large number of people work is the thing that above all else they want to do. Usually the joys that accompany creative art and exploration are associated with the professions. This is because we have been slow to appreciate the beauty of the machine and the appeal it has for those who instead of being driven by it direct and control its operation. There is a fascination not merely in the significant and ordered array of polished mechanism but also in the precision with which huge masses of metal can be fitted in moving adjustment to the inconceivably infinitesimal fraction of an inch. The machine with its many wonders holds the promise of satisfaction for multitudes of workers. Having assembled and emphasized the isolated monotony that exists only too often in manual labor, it will ultimately by its own increase reduce the number of its slaves and in their stead put masters. Already the long lines of manual operators in scores of telephone exchanges

have been released and replaced by those marvellous columns of rods and coils and magnets that work for us with an almost infallible accuracy. This is the way of progress. In the same direction there should be wider opportunity for the worker to have a voice in the control of his environment so that a new sense of freedom may come to him, and his employment may offer him many of the pleasures of his recreations.

The quality and character of our work should always determine the quality and character of our activities during leisure. It is in the well balanced ration that for most people the greatest returns will lie. The more monotonous the work the more variety and adventure should be found in leisure. The life that is filled with discovery and the exercise of the creative faculties may well seek more opportunity for appreciation and passive enjoyment. A change of work may involve a change in the use of leisure. Witness the newly appointed stenographer of a case working agency: "My job's so interesting I don't have to go to the movies now." The greatest happiness will be found where recreation supplements work.

Leisure cannot be isolated from the rest of life. It is all one. Leisure only dramatizes, only throws into relief the age old question that asks the meaning and the purpose of existence. Leisure is the time that we have to do what we want to do. In being the first to experience it, this fortunate generation is but having a foretaste of a future when through the reduction and the sublimation of work man in every hour of every day may be doing, if he will, that which he desires.

The tools of leisure are many and various. There is little indeed in the range of human interest that, if we but capitalize the knowledge and facilities we now have, cannot be helped to find expression. The implements await the hand that can take them—the integrated and adjusted human personality which is the goal of social case work. They even hold within themselves those satisfactions and securities which can make their possessor the master of his tools.

These tools are in many places, they can be everywhere. In cathedral or meeting house, on the athletic field, in the laboratory, in the home, in the school, on the open road they await us. They are ours to unlock the gates of life. They offer us beauty in line and in color, in the perfection of mechanism, in the rhythm of poet, dancer, athlete, musician, in the swing of trees in the wind, in all the harmonies of nature. They invite our skill in sport and in the formal arts. They entertain us with the sight and hearing of new things, a world brought to our eyes and ears by the genius of the machine. What a world also do they give us to see for ourselves, the world of travel and the world of the laboratory, the universe of microscope and telescope, infinitely small and infinitely great, receding ever and beckoning us to further wonders. Here is material for meditation and worship and here also is the call to join in coöperative effort for the common good, to reduce danger and unhappiness, to make gardens of waste places. In everything is the spirit of human fellowship for those who will make it theirs, a kinship that is as far flung as humanity but which centers in the family. Under its influence the home becomes a free relationship, a place to which each member brings the riches of his experience and where each finds both security and adventure in comradeship and in love.

Surely the unborn spirits must eagerly await a life that offers so much to appreciate, to create, to discover, so much in communion with one's fellows, so much to wonder at and to try to understand.

The number of those who achieve and who may achieve these things is growing. Leisure increases. Work recedes, and as it recedes begins in itself to offer new possibilities. We are now so close to the dreams of the ancients that they are turning to life and for our own dreams we must look to the future. There we catch the vision of Utopias compared with which the Utopias of the past are but the letters of an alphabet, an alphabet from which our children's children will frame the realities of their golden age.

THE MEANING OF THE CONFERENCE[1]

FRANK J. BRUNO
Chairman, Committee on Family Life

FROM Charity to The Family: this is the gamut through which social case work has developed in the period which we are here commemorating. In the person of our chairman, we stretch our hands back to the group of Oxford enthusiasts who were fired by the scientific victories in the field of physics and chemistry to believe that if they could use the same patience and the same fidelity to facts in the field of social relations it would be possible to make a new earth of this bitter thing which we call living. Mr. Wilcox, knowing Mr. Gurteen, is the tie by which we are in true succession from the pioneers in social research and social work. Mr. Gurteen, himself, doubtless knew Toynbee, Canon Barnett, and the others of that epoch making group who believed that the causes of social distress could be known as accurately as the causes of social phenomena; and who had the clarity of vision to see one thing which many of their successors have not appreciated—that the methods of the physical sciences might not be applicable in research. The laboratory is the great tool of the scientific investigator. These men said, "we too need a laboratory; but any attempt to reproduce the laboratory we know would defeat our aims. We cannot study social data at Cambridge and Oxford; we must go to live where the data is." The East End of London became their laboratory, and the people who passed their days in its overcrowded and neglected area were their specimens and exhibits.

They also broke away from the methodology of the physical scientists in that they cared a lot about the subjects of their study; and it meant a good deal to them how they fared. In my early days in social study, it used to be said that, just as it makes no difference to the biologist whether a centipede has one hundred legs or ninety nine, so to the true social scientist it should make no difference whether people were happy or unhappy, successful or not, delinquent or law abiding. That is a literal application of a scientific method to the field of social science which breeds nothing but disaster and sterility. The earlier workers in London were wiser; they had standards of living, of health, of cleanliness; and they cared tremendously whether people reached them or not. Have we not come back to that same attitude? We have modified many of their methods; we now see that the problem is far more complicated than they dreamed. But we still believe that in these two respects they were right: to secure social data one must know people intimately; and to get anywhere with either research or treatment, one must be tremendously interested in these same people.

The word charity is the evidence of their interest in people. As Mrs. Glenn has said, it is a noble word; there are few words which have come down to us from old English days with a richer social connotation. It is significant of its meaning that the earliest translators of the Bible into English used the word charity as the English equivalent of one of the two Greek words for "love"—the one which is free from passion and the desire for possession, and is never used in forming English words, as the other one "phileo" is. It means an unselfish outreaching of emotion and protection: the love of God; the love of a parent; the love of country. In our early English days, charity meant that, apparently. Surely there could be nothing better to express the attitude and the motive of the quest upon which these early pioneers had ventured. And perhaps, as Mrs. Glenn has said, that word will come back into its own better, if it is used less; if we take it out of the arena of controversy and rival techniques, and allow its real possibilities to revive under a more protected atmosphere. But the change from Charity to Family is more than a protest against the degradation of a word; it is symptomatic of a different point of view. Charity denoted an attitude; the Family denotes a social institution. There is a subtle but very real danger in assuming the possession of an attitude. The use of

[1] Given at the Anniversary Dinner, Wednesday evening, October 5, 1927.

the words The Family merely indicates that social case work has hit upon the basic social institution as the objective of its efforts. It does not assume an attitude, it describes an area of activity. There is no reason to believe that the founders of the Charity Organisation Society of London or of Buffalo were any more charitable, in the literal sense of the word, than thousands of others in England at that time, or than men had been in any age. In attitudes, we have no evidence that men have changed much. In skills and resources and communication, the opportunity and form of charitable acts have changed greatly; but it is presumptuous to assume that any group of modern men or women are any more kindly disposed toward their fellow men than the men and women of any previous age. Miss Colcord, in one of her papers, puts it concretely: "I shouldn't wonder," she writes, "if the Roman father voluntarily unbent at times and showed his sons how they threw the Roman variant of an inshoot when he was a boy." The difference between generations is not in attitudes, but in resources and skills. The loss of the word charity, therefore, in our title may really be a gain, in that it releases us from the possibility of a false assumption. All we have a right to claim is the possession of skills and of access to resources. Others should say whether we are charitable in the way we use them.

The use of the word Family is not without its own dangers, as it commits social case work to the family as its objective and assumes that the causes and the effects of social maladjustments are to be found in it. This may or may not be true, as a scientific hypothesis. This danger is lessened by the experiences of the two generations since the beginning of social work. We have seen poverty and sickness and disaster affect people, and they have held up their heads against fate without the slightest concession. We have seen minor reverses crumple an individual, children with apparently good advantages turn out socially unsuccessful. And the common denominator has seemed to be the family. In the first series, there has been coherence in family ties which has borne the individual over tragedy; in the latter series, family disruption or conflict laid the ground for defeat before the individual faced his test. Not always, to be sure: no social phenomenon is 100 per cent true. But it is so generally true that we have come to accept the family as the touchstone of social value, as thousands of families have passed before us, and we have attempted to check up something of cause and effect.

The adoption of this hypothesis marks a stage, perhaps the first definite landmark, since the university group went down to the East End of London to study social data first hand. It means that social case work is equipped with a working hypothesis from which it may make its further researches and, as is probably necessary in all social research, from which it may launch its educational and interpretative program. We have passed from the negative or formless stage of scientific investigation where the mind, supposedly, is entirely open, with no theories or hypotheses to guide it, going obediently, blindly, in the direction of its data in theory (although actually with a mind dominated by any number of untested theories) to the positive aspect of the scientific method, where there is the beginning at least of a chart or, if you prefer, of a program.

What has social work to say about the family? The answer has been given throughout this conference. May I suggest a brief and tentative summary? In the first place, it is quite clear from our experience, backed up here as everywhere else by an abundance of so-called "common sense evidence," that success in family life does not depend upon any external excellencies or resources but upon the degree of its inherent integration. Culture does not secure it. Even ability to think straight on the part of both parents does not guarantee it. The craziest or most erroneous ideas held by parents and taught by them to their children may not injure the texture of a particular family. This is particularly important to remember, in view of the tremendous developments in skills in child training. All the skills in the world may not help the strength of family life. Skills, resources, amenities, may enrich and strengthen the family, but only as they are incorporated into its life. This is but a negative way of insisting upon the well known fact that the

family is a social entity of its own; its strength varies with the degree of close integration of its ideals, religion, aims, and interests, not upon the quality of these characteristics. That is why it is possible to use that very dangerous analogy, a living organism, when we speak of a family. It is a self-sustaining unit, determining what it will receive and what reject; placing the stamp of its individuality upon the raw material which it absorbs from its environment. Not so much that which surrounds a family as the nature of its interrelationships determines what it will be. Therefore, in any study of family weakness, or of strength for that matter, the environment of the family tells us something; but only the gross affairs, such as starvation or luxury; education or illiteracy. To know the family one must find out how it takes these experiences into its vital processes and works them over into its life. On this point we are fairly certain of our data, but have scarcely a guess as to how it is brought about. We speak of one family as good, another as bad; one as strong, another as weak; one as a rich source of inspiration to its members, another as a desert containing only death. But these are subjective judgments in the first place; and even if we could agree upon the definitions, we should have almost no way to determine the how or the why. These are tasks for our successors.

We may be in darkness regarding the reason, but the facts stare us in the face. When irreconcilable streams meet in the family, running parallel but not fusing into a unity, its children are left socially undernourished, or, if I may change my figure of speech, they are cheated out of a certain birthright without which their own integration is neglected at certain points. Parents of different religious faiths, unless one of them by consent or events maintains a dominant position, bring us children of no faith. Parents of different cultural heritages have great difficulty in passing either of them intact over to their children. But more tragic is the conflict created by a difference between the culture of the parents and the culture in which the child is reared. It has for some time been a commonplace that the real problem with immigration is not the immigrant, but his American born and American educated children. In such a situation fundamental flaws are introduced into the unity of family life. It does not make any difference whether the Italian mother is right or wrong in her judgment of what her young daughter should do; nor is the situation any better if the daughter is right in her conduct, as judged by all American standards. Right and wrong have lost their meaning. The social fact is that, instead of integration of family life, we have conflict; instead of growing together insensibly into a vital unity, we have continuous conflicts. Of course, they may be solved; a very wise parent, or an unusually submissive child may make the necessary adjustment. But they are solved only when one of them attempts to realize some sort of unity by suppressing the causes of conflict.

In the next place, one of the most striking findings of social case work, and which comes nearer to being its own than any other, is that one of the most important (possibly the most important) of all conditions for success in family life is continuity of its membership. Child-placing agencies have shown that it is better to spend time and money in trying to make a present home fit for the child, than to transfer it to another, even though a much better one. Prentice Murphy, at the Providence Conference, made the statement, as I remember it, that "if one-tenth of the money which has been spent in taking children from their homes and trying to fit them into new and better ones had been diverted toward keeping together the homes in which they were born, some real advance in social welfare might have been recorded." It would seem that this thing which I have called the integration of family life is a matter of slow growth; but, given the chance, it will develop. Again the analogy of the living organism suggests itself. Grafting, transplanting, pruning are surgical operations. Strength for the organism is secured only by allowing it to grow. The longer the life flows through its connected parts the stronger the integration becomes; and the more healthy it becomes, the more successfully does the organism perform its functions. The child and, to a lesser extent, the parent who is not transplanted from one home to another develops that wholesome

ingenuousness by which he takes things for granted, is not too self-conscious of his strengths and weaknesses, acquires a sense of belonging there in the very nature of things. Changing from one home to another challenges all these elemental attitudes, and creates an interest in self which may become even morbid. Many an oft-placed child has come to look upon himself as an "interesting case." Naturalness and spontaneity are impossible for such a child.

This has nothing to do with happiness or cultural richness of a home. It may be an unhappy home; it may be a poor one; it may be an ignorant one; there may be a member in it whose influence is bad. But to these influences, as to the better ones, its members more or less unconsciously adjust themselves. It can be done, if the home is continuous. What that means in training future man and woman in adjustability to difficult social conditions we can easily guess. But the continuous home will do it; it maintains its unity, absorbing into its strong life even these unpleasant elements of its existence. You remember how Robert Frost said

> Home is the place where, when you have to go there,
> They have to take you in.

The poet leads us to think of ourselves as the prodigal returning to a not too enthusiastic home. For our purposes, it is better to change rôles, and think of ourselves—or of the home—as the none too enthusiastic welcomers, but at the same time as taking the prodigal in as a matter of course.

You can easily see here that we are dealing with relative values. There is much to be said on the other side: the duty of self-expression, and of individual right to development in accordance with the best educational and cultural ideals obtainable, the importance of being objective about ourselves, and of appraising friends and foes with even justice. I am not quarreling with that side; I merely wish to point out that individualism has little to teach us about the function of the family; that its sources of strength, the conditions of its life are different and, perhaps, not so highly or so consciously prized in this day of great individual and material advancement as in former ages.

The third quality which social case work has demonstrated as essential to family life is affection. This, of course, is not new; it is the clear, unmistakable pole star which guides the formation of families, and which shines so brightly as children come into them and blossom out into men and women under the hands of their parents. But being so close, possibly its essential nature is not so clear as it might be. Miss Elsa Ueland said at a recent National Conference that experience with young girls at Carson College had demonstrated that "a child would rather live in a home where it belonged, where its elders were concerned about its doings, provoked at its failures, pleased at its successes, even if it were treated with harshness, than to live in a home where it is treated with perfect fairness and wisdom, but without affection, without the sense that its success or failure made any difference to its elders."

As I see it, affection plays two important parts in the home. In the first place, it provides the motive which leads parents to make the greatest possible efforts in behalf of their children; in the early years to insure their health, then their education, then their training in the niceties of life. Under no other situation could there be any assurance that the rich heritage of culture in the possession of any one generation would be passed on to the next. The willingness of mother and father to skimp and to save, to toil and struggle that the child may have a chance—these are the social answers to the love we bear our children. But Miss Ueland has pointed out another aspect of affection in the family; it awakens motives in the child himself to make the answering efforts to the parents' teachings. On this point, while we have an abundance of practical evidence, there is almost no scientific analysis or examination of just how or why motive in the child is awakened by the love of his parents. Yet there it stands as the atmosphere of life in which the spirit of the family thrives.

There are probably other qualities or conditions which promote or retard the development of family life; but none, I think, at the present time which can be said to have been made unmistakably clear by social case work. As in so many other aspects of our

task, we are but at the beginning of our journey of discovery. We can record what we have seen, mark out the lines for future exploration, but must leave most of the work to be undertaken by our successors.

We do not need to know any more than this, however, to see the great possibilities inherent in the family. This was brought out in all the sharper relief by the attitude of criticism and pessimism regarding the family so widely current in press and on platform. When, therefore, Miss Richmond suggested that we celebrate our fiftieth anniversary by a conference which should bring together the best thought we could assemble on the subject of the strengths of family life, it instantly appealed to our member societies. We believed the time had come to stop denouncing it, or scolding it for its short-comings; that it was worthy of better and more careful study than it had yet received; and that our fiftieth anniversary was a good time to say so.

Again, we felt it was opportune to hold such a conference because there is a body of knowledge coming into existence which can throw light upon the question of the modern family, and will, we believe, lead the way for the development of a stronger family life of the future.

May I take a few minutes to point out some of these promising aspects? Biology is breaking away from the fatalistic determinism of Weismann and of the more literal eugenicists and giving us a hint of the infinite flexibility of the human mind; telling us that while capacity is fixed at birth, form of conduct which that capacity shall take is apparently entirely undetermined, and that we do not really know what that capacity is itself. You remember those untold millions of potential neuron terminals and connections which Herrick has written about in his *Brains of Rats and Men;* raw material for literally endless possibilities in habit formation; nothing there but a switchboard; its net-work of connections to be woven into it by the experience of the individual. If the human race once could free itself from the shackles of determinism—religious, economic, and biological, to say nothing of the present fad of psychological determinism—a new day of hope would be opened for human beings. Emphasis would swing from human limitations to human possibilities. With the knowledge of the important part which the family plays in weaving the early and therefore the fundamental patterns on that switchboard of habit, the family would come to be seen as something far more important than the happiness or the self-realization of its contracting parties; its function would stand out clearly as the institution by which the child born into it most successfully develops this vast potentiality.

And then has come the concept of social heritage. Recognition of it is not so new as some of us were inclined to think it. But, however long or short a time men have recognized it, we are dimly seeing how all of our boasted culture and skills are the slow accumulation of the ages through which men have struggled up from their bestial ancestors. No one generation adds much to it, however much it may be conscious of creating. Compared with what it receives from its predecessors, each generation's contribution is very small. Art, literature, philosophy, religion, government, money, everything which we think of as human in contrast with biological has been created by ancestors, and handed down from generation to generation. No one has ever charted social heritage as Linnaeus charted living organisms or the astronomers have counted the stars in the heavens. If for one generation—as Graham Wallas has pointed out, it were to be forgotten, we should disappear from off the face of the earth within a period measured only by months. The transference of this invaluable heritage accounts for many of the institutions of society, such as church, school, and community; but none of them takes just the place of the family in this task. If the next generation is not to be socially cheated out of its heritage, the families of this generation must be strong, well integrated, fully accepting their responsibilities. This gives a positive note to the subject of the family; not very clear, perhaps, in its outlines, but sweeping away much of the trash and questionable discussion of the usefulness of the family and placing it upon an impregnable basis. In a literal sense, the family is the conservator and transmitter of

the social gains of the ages; without it we should fall back into a state even lower than that of savages.

What has been said up to the present is true of the family in all time. There is no particular pertinence to such a discussion at this time, except as other and present factors have brought the subject of family behavior into a new prominence. Two world wide movements have occurred within the recent past which may rightly be called revolutions: one is so called, the Industrial Revolution. Of that, and the stresses which it has placed upon the family, we have heard a good deal at this conference. We are certain to study it more closely, and to neutralize such unfortunate effects as it may have created. But of the second, and to me the more important of the two revolutions, little has been said, although it underlies the entire modern world: that is, the rise and growth of the scientific spirit as it results in the rationalizing of conduct. While in past times the family has varied widely from place to place, and at different periods, conformity to a particular form was enforced with fair rigidity in each of them. There are—or were—few social controls which acted with greater inflexibility, even to the point of severe personal discomfort or death than the controls which enforced sexual and marital conduct. There is a wealth of social evidence on this point which does not need to be touched on, as the earliest of our American sociologists, Sumner, and the latest writer in the same field both emphasize it. This enforcement, however, rested in the hands of impersonal but none the less real social forces: customs, traditions, religions, systems of morals, public opinion, and, to a slight extent, law. Back of them all, however, there rested authority. The prescribed behaviors were enforced because, as was said, they were right. They were not discussed. It was impious to call their validity into question. One who violated their sanctions was ostracized. All of this was highly automatic and fairly uniform. Nor should it be forgotten that even yet in the field of sex and marital relationships the customs and taboos of society are widely enforced.

But the field of behavior will never again be so largely subject to the arbitrary rule of authority. The scientific spirit has led men to question the basis of all beliefs, as well as of all matter. Almost within the life of this generation reason has taken the place of authority as the guide to behavior. When the reason for sex or marital acts is to be found in their appeal to the individual judgment, it is obvious that people will show less uniformity than when they act in response to vigorous authority. One does not need a profound knowledge of psychology to predict that in such a situation decisions would be made, very largely, not in accordance with the abstract merits of the case, but in accordance with desire. One with any intelligence can usually find a good reason for doing the thing he wants to do. To the first advocates of the rational basis of ethics, the substitution of reason for authority appeared as the enfranchisement of the human soul. If men were free to create the morality they needed, there was no reason, it was argued, why the Millennium should not immediately be ushered in. It is no disservice to reason to point out the fallacy of any such expectations: to point out that while such a result, somewhat modified perhaps, might happen in many individuals, there is nothing contained in such a program to insure that such a result would take place universally. If there were time, it would be instructive to follow this road, bordered by authority on one side and reason on the other; to show how reason has ever been contemptuous of authority, looked upon its ideas as superstitious and its customs as accidents, while authority has ever striven to silence the voice of reason.

Far be it from one drilled in the scientific method of approaching questions to throw discredit upon the use of intelligence in this field of human activity. It is enormously superior to the blind government of traditional authority. It contains great promises of future possibilities. But it has not been an unmixed gain. You remember one of the oft-quoted passages from the Bible,

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

This is not a particularly clear statement, but whatever its original intent, it has an eloquent lesson here. It says, freedom may be gained only by finding the truth. Our way has been to place freedom first. The quotation puts truth first, and freedom as a

sequence. But when freedom comes first, there is nothing to prevent it from being merely unrestraint, which has neither social nor other value. Freedom to do as one chooses does not insure that the free spirit will find the truth to guide it. Freedom which comes from the mastery of a skill, such as freedom to play a piano, is won; it comes only by hard work. Freedom to play the piano, considered merely as lifting the ban against touching it, may produce hideous discords. Robert Park described the hobo somewhat along this line; he says in *The City:* "He [the hobo] has gained his freedom, but he has lost his direction."

There is another aspect of this pursuit of unrestraint which is equally important for any student of the family; it leads one to undervalue, or totally to disregard, the worth of customs or controls which he does not understand. The present age is quite contemptuous of its predecessors. (In this, incidentally, it differs not a whit from these same predecessors except in so far as the basis of a good deal of its criticisms is the so-called superstitious and formal elements in their lives.) Miss Richmond, in *The Good Neighbor,* says, "Civilization drops every now and then some necessary part of its luggage . . . and has to travel back to pick it up. . . . We have had so many houses that we have been forced to rediscover fresh air, and so many cooked dishes that we have been forced to rediscover milk and eggs." To social science and to every honest mind, every social custom, or tradition, or religion, or institution had a significance, and that significance is usually to be found in the way it protected some social value: courtesy; kindliness; safety from animals, bacteria, or human enemies. I wonder whether the time will ever come when these mores, the crystallizations of the wisdom of the past, will be looked upon with awe, yes the reverence, with which the archeologist looks upon a trilobite. Socially they are just as significant. It does not mean that we should revive the old customs—that would be impossible, as well as undesirable; but it is tremendously important that we should discover and protect their social value; that we should learn the truth which they have to teach, and then, if we are wise enough, translate them into their modern equivalent.

The family has suffered severely from this neglect of the mores; and the capital crime against its nature has been to regard it as an institution designed, or to be used, for the satisfaction or the self-realization of the man and woman who together begin it. There is no evidence that the happiness or the personal development of the contracting parties was ever valued highly by the social experience which selected the mores of our race. Yet much of the present-day literature, especially of the more radical school, is making just that use of our intellectual bursting of bonds of authority: it has assumed, without any inquiry, that the acid test of the family is the degree of happiness it guaranteed to its adult members—and often to one adult member—and rejects all hindrances as superstitious.

It is evidence of the toughness of fiber of the family that, taken by and large, it has so successfully withstood this double threat to its existence: the destruction of its economic function, and the disappearance of its automatic controls before coherent and intelligent substitutes had been worked out. One of the reasons for this success is the persistence of ideals of conduct, after the more formal controls had passed. Another is that the change has been gradual, considered from the point of view of a single life span; there is a great deal of control by mores still left; authority continues to dominate the thinking and acts of a large share of contemporary mankind. Witness fundamentalism. But progress is in the direction of rational guidance in place of the control of behavior by mores and authority. And it is significant that social work in the modern sense came into existence just as we were beginning to make this change; it has had its greatest growth in places where the change has gone farthest; and perhaps it will have its mettle most sharply tested in the future as increasing numbers of men and women throw off the restraints of custom and authority and attempt to substitute their undisciplined wills as guides to conduct. Of course, so long as we are social beings, having all sorts of relations with others like ourselves, and each relation involves its own obligations, de-

termination of what those obligations involve will never be left literally to single individual judgments. The necessity of living together in some sort of harmony will force rules, constraints, laws, and duties, which may not be very careful of the individual. Fascism in Italy is a good illustration of this. The saying which expresses the hope of the oppressed, "When the tale of bricks is doubled, Moses comes," can be paraphrased with equal pertinence into the statement, "When individualism threatens social stability, Mussolini comes."

Here, it seems to me, is the significance of such a conference as this. We are considering the oldest, the most intimate and the most precious of all social institutions. Its task is the preservation of the very soul of mankind. It has gathered to itself all sorts of accidental forms and functions; conformity to its mores has been enforced by sacred traditions and the oldest authority. Much that is accidental about it is changing or falling away. But the need for the family is greater than ever, even as the values it preserves have increased. It is our task, therefore, to know it better, to guide public opinion regarding its high office, and, as Mrs. Fisher said in her paper, to challenge the young people of this age to the great adventure.

Soberly speaking, our task is two-fold: first, fact-finding; to search for the truth, that we may win a real freedom. Social case workers have been the greatest group of fact-finding workers in this field, and possibly will remain such. Social case work is one of the two laboratories of social science. It has never quite learned how to use its great wealth of material in a scientific manner, but that will come. When it arrives, the obligation to make known its findings will accompany it. That, too, is a technique of which our present publicity gives us only hints. But in the very nature of our job, inherent in the concept of case work, the intelligent co-operation of all society is essential to social progress.

The second part of our task is much more difficult—that of forging some sort of controls to act as substitutes for the automatic mores and the accepted authority. This is a job for social statesmanship, for it is definitely in what David Adie has called a conflict area. There are always those whose interests are curtailed by any effort to prescribe conduct and who will therefore oppose such efforts vigorously. The story of our Eighteenth Amendment is an eloquent exhibit of the possibility and the costs of control by one agency alone—the law.

There are two extremes which this task will have to avoid. On the one side there is the danger that the opposition to control will be so vigorous as to postpone its application until a condition bordering on chaos ensues. Our marriage habits and some aspects of business procedures are illustrations of successful resistance to control after the wisdom of some sort of control has been demonstrated.

The other danger is imminent when the resistance to control is weak, when a clear majority imposes its will upon a small or incoherent minority. Then we get arbitrary and sometimes violently reactionary means: the Baumes law, for instance. In our field, that of the family, we are in greater danger of that sort of action; efforts to restore customs and behaviors of the past; the use of arbitrary authority of church or social group to enforce behaviors of doubtful social values. We stand in more danger of these arbitrary, unthinking efforts to control behavior in the field of family life than of any sort. Such moves only postpone the time when the matter can come into the field of honest discussion—out of which only may workable solutions be developed.

And yet, when all is said and done, the family is a life not to be brought to its richest possibilities by merely setting metes and bounds. Social control carries a negative connotation, barriers erected to prevent members of society from doing certain things. But there is a dynamic aspect in this same field which is far more important. How may the young people of today be challenged to want to do that which is socially desirable? That, in reality, is the test of any social program. It is too late when the wrong desires or habits have been formed. They must be controlled, if they have been allowed to arise. But the hope of an intelligently social society rests in preventing the development of the anti-social habits by the cultivation and promotion of

those qualities on which the well-being of social living depends. No one can watch the simple ceremonial of the Camp Fire Girls without realizing the tremendous energies which are available, if they are but rightly released. All the group program activities among young people, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Girl Reserves, HiY boys, and many others are fitting places, in these days of transition, to prepare the new generation for a proper conception of family life. They probably hold the key to this important aspect of our subject. The family, itself, in transferring so many of its functions to specialized agencies, will probably have to depend upon such extraneous aids as these to bridge the gap between the period when familial responsibility was carried as a matter of course and the time when the family will itself know how to transfer such motives to its own members. One cannot be certain in a matter of this sort. At any rate, some method must be devised to furnish a never-ending source of inspiration and challenge to the young of every generation, so that the torch of life may be held on high and handed on undimmed to the next generation.

THE FAMILY

VOL. VIII DECEMBER, 1927 No. 8

MARGARET E. RICH, *Editor*
RUTH M. GRAVES, *Business Manager*
Published as the official organ of the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR ORGANIZING FAMILY SOCIAL WORK
LINTON B. SWIFT, *Executive Secretary*

THE FAMILY is published monthly, except in August and September (ten issues a year). Subscription, $1.50 a year; contributing subscription, $3.00; single copies, 20 cents. Checks may be drawn to the order of Lawson Purdy, Treasurer, and mailed to the General Office, 130 East 22d Street, New York, N. Y.

Changes of address should reach the General Office by the 19th of the month, in order to be effective for the next month's issue.

EDITORIALS

THE torch on our cover this month was the symbol adopted for the Conference on Family Life in America Today. It has a twofold significance: it carries fire and it carries light. It is a beautiful symbol of heredity as carrying forward that divine fire which is life; it serves also as an emblem of the light passed on from hand to hand by those who are illumined by the same ideals.

Life itself has continuity and the great conservator of that continuity is the family. As a young mother once wrote, after the birth of her first child, "It seems to me that a torch has been lighted which will burn forever." Weismann, in his *Theory of the Continuity of the Germ Plasm,* speaks of it as "the torch of life passed on from generation to generation as the torch in the Greek races was handed on from runner to runner."

It has also a peculiar significance in connection with a meeting which considered its subject in the light of fifty years of experience. In Grecian antiquity the lampedeedromia or torch race was held on a moonless night. The torches were lighted at the altar of the divinity whom it was intended to honor. Usually the race was in honor of a fire god, Prometheus, Vulcan, or some other. "The race," says an editorial writer in the *New York Times,* "was not always to the swift but to those who kept the torch alight to the goal." One form of the lampedeedromia was a relay race in which the torch was handed on from hand to hand. It is in the field of ideals rather than material things that the symbol applies to the continuity in family social work. From the loyally devoted hands of the first leaders the torch of their ideals has been passed on to us and the responsibility to keep it burning is now ours.

It is the concern of society as a whole that life should go on from age to age, ever growing in fineness of expression and that the forces which surround it should offer a favoring environment for such development. But a special responsibility rests on those who are able to visualize the effects of conditions which are adverse to such progress, and who on the positive side can keep freshly before them the objectives of the race in which generation after generation carries forward the lighted torch.

Family social workers are necessarily absorbed in the treatment of the social diseases of the family. The Buffalo meeting brought out the intimate relation between the treatment of these diseases and the social health of the community. Our fashions, our amusements, our industries, our ingenious devices and inventions, and our "strenuous scramble for everything movable" can all be tested in the long run by the way in which our attitude toward these things helps or hinders a saner and more wholesome family life.

THE program was planned, not to bring out the techniques of family social workers during the last fifty years, but to discover what material things and institutions and persons are doing to family life in these United States today.

Only five of the speakers on the regular program were practicing social workers. The other nine brought to the subject the different viewpoints of industry, religion, biology, sociology, home economics, education.

At the opening session, Mrs. Glenn[1] gave us the historical setting for the Conference with her story of the development of family social work during the last fifty years. Miss Hamilton's paper[1] at the same session outlined the contributions of social case work towards an understanding and strengthening of family life. The two papers brought out strongly not merely that it is our function to conserve but that we have in our hands wonderful tools by means of which to effect changes.

[1] See the December *Survey Graphic.*

Dorothy Canfield Fisher's plea for "a state of mind, a song to march to, some stirring fanfare" struck the keynote of the meetings. "Before every one of us," she said, "lies a whole new world to be shaped by the creative instinct. . . . Out of the capacity to scream aloud the creative impulse has made Wagne.ian operas. . . . Here is a new frontier to be conquered, a new spiritual region to be subdued . . . but not too much wrinkling of the brows over these, if you please." . . . Her challenge for a renewal of the "instinctive rush of high spirits over obstacles to conquer" and her test of the need for a return to "the old traditional delight in exploring and taming the unknown" were met and realized by the Conference itself in its tone and quality.

The heart of the Conference was a series of papers, during two morning sessions, by Herbert S. Jennings, William F. Ogburn, Ernest R. Groves, Dorothy Canfield Fisher and Mary E. Richmond. Taken as a whole these papers constitute, by their authoritative opinion, specific suggestions, and implied trends of action, a fundamental program for the enrichment of family life in its broadest and deepest sense. Karl de Schweinitz' paper on New Tools of Leisure[2] smoothed any wrinkling brows, and the neighborhood, industrial and economic settings of the modern family were presented in papers of unusual excellence.

There were many challenging notes: Mrs. Fisher's charmingly stimulating phrases; Dr. Jennings' assurance as a biologist that man has begun too late to develop a new system for the nurture of his young—"He should have begun before he was a mammal"; Dr. Ogburn's proposal for scientific study of the affectional ties in the development of personality (the one remaining unique function of the family); Dr. Groves' expression of the need for more information regarding successful marriages; Miss Richmond's tracing of the leadership and strategy in the health movement and her prophecy that a similar community awakening with respect to marriage is near; and Karl de Schweinitz' phrase, "Home is where the family is, not where the house is."

All this embodies not only an inspiration but a challenge. For one thing it suggests that we need to make a more extended and scientific study of the problems with which family social workers are dealing. What have we found in our day-to-day work that will help us develop the affectional ties in family life of which Professor Ogburn[3] spoke? Are we consciously recognizing the possibilities of what Dr. Eliot[3] calls "the new neighborhood" in influencing the thinking and behavior of the family group? Are we utilizing all available material in helping the younger generation in our maladjusted families to prepare themselves for marriage and parenthood and thus avoid at least some of their parents' difficulties? What is our conception of the part religion may play in family life and are we in our case records showing the elements of success and failure in our efforts to utilize the influence of the church? What is a successful family? Have we made as good use as we might of the material available in our records for the analysis of the qualities which make for success or failure? Have we really tested the results of our attempts to apply knowledge gained in scientific research in other fields? Are we ready to concentrate on the next steps which Miss Richmond outlined?

The Buffalo meetings gave us a redefinition of our goals, a new sense of the values in family life, a practical program for enhancing those values through an objective consideration of the social health of the family and its interdependence with community health. The Fiftieth Anniversary of Family Social Work marked not a goal achieved but a new vision, a blending of old and new ideals. It was a hilltop from which we may envisage the course of our race, the direction in which our torch bearers should turn their eager steps.

WE CANNOT forego this opportunity to congratulate the Conference Committee on the purely material success of its plans. The registration showed 961 people in attendance. This figure does not include many who came in without registering, guests in the hotel and others. Six hundred and fifty-two of the registrants were from outside Buffalo: they represented 133 cities in 26 states, and included 63 delegates from

[2] See page 251.

[3] See the December *Survey Graphic*.

Canada and 3 from England. There were 72 board members and volunteers, 158 from professional groups other than social work, 482 who are connected with family social work organizations (including mothers' assistance, Jewish social service, and so on) and 137 from other case work fields. This attendance is much larger, although possibly it represents fewer cities, than the usual attendance at the annual meetings of the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work.

The Buffalo Conference was the fruit of a year and a half of intensive work and of a much longer period during which the idea of a celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of family social work was mulled over in many minds. When Miss Richmond first made the proposal to the Association in 1922 there was no definite plan as to the form the celebration might take. Numerous suggestions were later made, discussed, and discarded before the final plans took shape.

Miss Richmond, as honorary chairman, gave unstintingly of her thought and time, not only in the origination of the central theme which the committee finally adopted but in the working out of details for attendance, the creation of the symbol, and in advising on the many matters connected with the program, speakers, publicity, and so on.

Mr. Bruno, chairman of the committee, contributed not only time and unselfish devotion but sound thought and unusual skill in drawing out others' ideas. All the twenty-five members of the committee participated in the thinking through of the various steps necessary to the orderly development of the conference. Mr. West, a member of the Association staff, served as committee secretary. He devoted his entire time for fifteen months to the integration of the program and to the carrying out of details of interpretation and co-ordination as well as the important but less interesting matters of attendance, finance, and conference machinery. He thought of the meeting not as a conference but as an occasion for a real and lasting contribution to social thinking. It was the first national conference in the family field and was distinguished by having as its objective not the conferring of a group but a series of meetings centered around a single theme. The Buffalo family society gladly merged their idea of their own celebration in that of the whole group and through their volunteers and staff members contributed much to the smooth running of the conference machinery.

The success of such a conference as this then would seem to depend on many factors: inspiration, creative group discussion, and uninterrupted attention to details large and small. It does not merely happen. We hope that at a later date the committee will give us a critical evaluation of their method which will stress both what they did and what, in the light of later events, they wish they had done. For the present they have a right to rest in the assurance of a good task unusually well done.

REMINISCENCES OF EARLY DAYS

THE luncheon on Reminiscences of Early Days was not merely a joyous occasion with Alexander Johnson warming our hearts with his fine humor and youthful spirit, but gave an historical perspective which made the Family Life Conference seem the inevitable outcome of the efforts of the last fifty years in charity organization and family case work. The speakers, with or without intent, showed that continuity of ideals, an unconscious passing on of the light from hand to hand, has characterized family case work.

Mr. Glenn quoted Miss Zilpha Smith who, thirty-seven years ago at the 1890 National Conference of Social Work, defined the area of our activity in the terms which Mr. Bruno describes as a modern development:

> We of the Charity Organization Societies come to the National Conference as few other members do, and owe it a peculiar debt. Most of you deal with poor persons or defective or delinquent persons as *individuals*, removed from family relations. We deal with the *family* as a whole, usually working to keep it together, but sometimes helping to break it up into units, and to place them in your care.

She discussed also one of the major problems which we are facing today, and one

which received a large share of attention in the Monday afternoon Round Table discussions.[1]

The Charity Organization Societies are largely represented here by their paid workers; and I fear that some may get the impression that at home they do most of the work, and that it can easily be left to two or three persons. Nothing could be a greater mistake. If there were ever a movement that required the help of each person in the community—men and women, rich and poor—it is a society for the organization of charity. I believe the chief danger before our societies is that, when the first leaders go, they may not leave others adequately trained to guide the work. I hope in our sectional meetings we shall learn from one another what methods have been employed for bringing new persons into knowledge of the work and into the management, so that the societies shall live a vigorous life for more than the generation that started them.

Another of the older ideals which ties the past to the present day is the concern, expressed in more than half of the papers given at the Buffalo sessions, of the family social worker with community conditions which affect family life. The effect of economic changes, of neighborhood influences, of new tools of leisure, the concern of the community with marriage—are they not but a restatement of the motive which led the Charity Organization Society of fifty years ago to write in its list of purposes that of interpreting case work data so as to better community conditions?

The fulfilling of this purpose, as Mr. Johnson pointed out, meant participation in efforts for social betterment. Poor housing, conditions that caused disease, child labor, were attacked not theoretically but with the evidence of their actual effect on human lives—evidence which workers with dependent families gathered in their day-to-day work.

The national aspects of family social work, the influence of one community upon another is old as well as new. Mr. Johnson spoke of this interdependence as shown in the growth of the family section of the National Conference. Mr. Hawley gave a concrete instance in his account of the development of the family society in Des Moines which was shaped to a large extent by the work previously organized in Cincinnati.

The interplay of theoretical teaching and practical social work was present fifty years ago as it is today, as Mrs. Spencer showed. Professor Peabody's letter of regret that he could not be present gives additional evidence:

I am touched by your kind remembrance of my interest in social work, and I recall with permanent happiness the friendships made with its leaders at the Conferences in Grand Rapids and Toronto so many years ago. It was a large part of my education as a teacher of social ethics to meet the men and women who were doing the things of which I was talking, and I returned from each such gathering to my academic duties with a sense of exhilaration and refreshment. I received much more than I was able to give.

I send my appreciative greetings to the company and my confident anticipation that the fiftieth anniversary of your work will mark not an end attained, but a fresh beginning of social wisdom and service.

Perhaps more than any other single event the luncheon brought out the long time view, the fact that fifty years of service marks "not an end attained but a fresh beginning," a new effort to realize our ideals. For this we need the experience and vision of the past as well as the insight and new knowledge of the present.

Dr. Brackett pointed out that the challenge of fifty years ago, which appealed to the forward looking of those days, was to bring order and thought into the treatment of distress, and to enrich it with true personal service. That appeal is still heard, for the task is not complete. And with it is heard the ringing challenge, out of experience, that we should order our work so as to get at more of our clients earlier—just as hygiene should advance with medicine—and that we use more of the power of religion in social case work.

Dr. Brackett added an interview that he had just had with the spirit of youth, which gave him high hope, in throwing out a challenge:

I who speak am the spirit of youth
Pressing ahead in my search for truth,
Do not ask me to linger along the way,
In order to listen to what you say,
You grey-haired ones, you have had your day.
And the future, the wonderful world to be,
Will reflect the visions which now I see.

Then age ventured to hold out his hand and reply:
I have had my day; you should pass me by;
But know that the future, if growth it be,
Has its roots deep down in the past and me.
I have worked, with my light, for a better earth,
So take my message for what it's worth.

[1] See "The Volunteer—a Paradox," by Ellen W. W. Geer, page 281.

Then the spirit of youth held back to take
That message, the legacy which age would make,
And to grasp his hand, for each other's sake.
So the voice of youth, as he hurried along,
Was blending with age in one endless song;
While each face seemed to the other to shine,
With a light reflecting a light divine.

The luncheon was indeed a touching of hands, not only with those of earlier days who were present but with that invisible group of pioneers whose high ideals we have not yet realized.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSIONS

The Round Table discussions which filled the afternoons at Buffalo offered the members of the Conference an opportunity to discuss some of the current problems of family case work in the light of the papers which had been given at the general sessions, and were valuable more in the challenges they presented than in the conclusions they reached. (Perhaps the biggest challenge is in the general lack of satisfaction with the round table method itself. We plan at a later date to present some criticisms of this method in the hope that, through an analysis of our reasons for dissatisfaction, we may contribute to the development of a better procedure. Theoretically, round table discussions should be creative group thinking; actually they sometimes resemble a pin-wheel gone wrong, with its initial brilliant sparks guttering to an untimely and dismal end.)

Mrs. Geer and Dr. Winchester have been good enough to give us their own interpretations of the main points of the discussions for which they were responsible. Mr. Swift's account of the two Round Tables on Relief Problems in Family Social Work appears in full in the November News Letter. *Brief reports of the other meetings are given below.*

The Family in Industry

MR. MUSTE, who had given a paper on The Integrity of Family Life as a Test of Industry,[1] led the Wednesday afternoon Round Table on The Family in Industry. The first question raised and briefly discussed was in connection with the apparent assumption in Mr. Muste's paper that unemployment was due to the capitalistic system; but attention was concentrated on various phases of the actual unemployment problem:

[1] See the December *Survey Graphic*.

I. The following causes of unemployment were **analyzed:**

(1) Seasonal occupation: It was felt that control of seasonal occupation would be possible to a relative degree although it was acknowledged that the regularizing of employment in one place might temporarily create difficulty in another.

(a) An interesting experiment in the clothing trade demonstrated the advantage of regulating employment by assessing the factory working forty weeks a year a less amount than the factory working thirty weeks a year in payment to the general fund of the unemployment insurance of the industry.

(b) Another suggestion was that of varying the work, as in coal and ice companies; or Henry Ford's scheme of factories surrounded by farms which could be worked in the off season; and the B. & O. railroad plan in which the men make repairs in the railroad shops in the slack season.

(2) Business cycle: While the bigger employment crisis would be eliminated by reducing the extremes of inflation and depression, it was recognized that this elimination might bring about the temporary under-employment which accompanies hand to mouth buying.

(a) The federal reserve system, because of its method of controling credit, tends to make periods of inflation and depression much less marked. Professor Sumner Slichter of Cornell was quoted as having said that he felt that the quick turnover now replacing the previous method of overstocking has helped materially to lessen tension in business affairs. He anticipated that business conditions would be "out of the

woods" before the end of the year.

(b) The policy of government building during the decline of private building operations in periods of depression was felt to be helpful, but in order to operate successfully it necessitates a policy of preparation in advance by having money on hand and by obtaining legislative authority for the projects prior to the period of depression.

(c) The building decline predicted three years ago has not yet arrived, it was stated, because of the increase in automobile owners and the resultant building of garages, "hot dog" stands, and development of new residential centers.

(3) Overproduction or overdevelopment: This condition of industry is exemplified in the coal field where there are too many workers to be employed continuously. As the result of machinery replacing labor to a great extent, something similar to interstate commerce control should be assumed at least temporarily by the state to help in the transfer of labor during the period of transition.

II. Where does the responsibility for relief in times of unemployment belong?

(1) Some schemes now in effect in factories were discussed. The Bethlehem Steel Corporation and a factory in Milwaukee have organized a reserve fund built up by the employees to which the management has contributed an equal amount. It was shown that this system actually was a forced saving and not insurance because the revenue has not had a chance to accumulate long enough to carry the scheme and both parties have had to continue payments. The group believed that the best results were obtained by forming employees' organizations to which employers contribute moral backing and financial support.

(2) The part-time employment device was considered useful. That it does not solve the difficulty is shown by the fact that the union miner thought he had won out because of his ability to earn $1500 in two hundred days' labor at $7.50 a day as against the non-union miner in another district who receives three hundred days' labor at $5.00 a day, earning the same $1500. A clothing factory, by guaranteeing work for a minimum of thirty-five hours a week to all satisfactory employees, found that after the first year the managers paid out very little money for idle time.

(3) Government employment bureaus were thought to eliminate some stress in times of unemployment. The group advocated municipal, county, and national bureaus, and urged that vocational guidance be included as a duty of the elementary schools.

(4) Various varieties of insurance were considered. A disadvantage in the contributory schemes of unemployment insurance is the penalizing of the more successful managers by the equal financial responsibility of all factories whether well or poorly managed.

Professor Todd wanted to see a variety of plans of insurance in competition, refusing to answer categorically the question as to the relative merits of government insurance versus union or trade insurance. He felt that unemployment was part of the load to be carried by industry, similar to accident and casualty insurance, and therefore should be included in the cost of production.

Mr. Muste felt that the demoralization in England was not caused by the kind of insurance but by the state of world trade, the coal situation, the backwardness of management and the unwillingness of the trade unions to acknowledge the changes in the situation caused by modern machinery.

Mr. Muste agreed that trade unions have done very little about insurance schemes. He felt that the whole field of insurance would develop greatly in the next few years, tending in general toward government control as in Europe. He suggested the case work method of individualizing treatment for particular cases and felt that it was necessary to discover some means of overcoming the premium that might be put on inefficiency by the wholesale resort to insurance which was coming in the near future.

III. What should be the relief policy of social agencies during strikes?

(1) Mr. Muste felt that strikes should be

regarded as a calamity like floods or cyclones and so treated as an emergency. There was disagreement on this point on the ground that the situations were dissimilar since individuals could control strikes.

(2) Mr. Muste felt that social workers were right in believing that the union should first attempt to carry the situation in giving the necessary relief. While the well organized trades were able to do this, in the unorganized and unskilled trades the unions were not equal to the job even though theoretically it might be argued that strike insurance ought to be a union responsibility.

Stockton Raymond felt that no relief should be offered to the family of a striker who refused to accept a job offered in another industry. If the strikers deserve public support in any particular struggle with capital, the relief funds of an organization given to relieve general distress should not be used but other funds purposely collected for the cause of relieving strike distress should be solicited and administered.

It was brought out that social workers do take sides in housing disputes and may as justly have opinions about the issues involved in an individual strike.

The Family and Its Neighborhood

THE Round Table on The Family and Its Neighborhood was designed primarily to supplement by discussion Dr. Eliot's excellent paper on the same subject.[2] Dr. Eliot was the leader and endeavored to draw out the opinions of the practical workers of the group rather than to advance his own theories.

Much of the discussion focused about the difference between city and rural neighborhood life. It was felt that the city neighborhood of fifty years ago still exists in the village neighborhood of today. There is a present tendency toward the widening of the neighborhood in both city and country, though in the village the neighborhood forces are still in control and they are so closely interrelated as to make a much more solid influence than we find in most cities. Thus differences in case work in the two kinds of communities are based on differences in neighborhood life rather than on differences in resources. The overwhelming influences for good or for ill, exerted by these neighborhood forces on the client frequently make case work with the community as well as with the client both necessary and desirable.

The migration of groups of country people to cities is constituting a new neighborhood problem in some cities. For instance a group of country people who have settled in Birmingham, Alabama, are as foreign to city life as any foreign born group is to the life of an American city. This native born group as well as the compact foreign born groups—Italian, Bohemian, Poles, and so on (which exist in so many of the larger cities)—are potent factors both for good and for ill in the lives not only of the clients of social agencies but of other members of their groups. On the whole it was felt that neighborhood forces are breaking down and that substitutes for this supervision of the community over family life must be found. Various suggestions were made, such as a better use of the church, of organizations like the St. Vincent de Paul Society, of settlements and other community organizations. For rural communities there is great value in the home and agricultural demonstrations given by county agents, especially in the south. Dr. Eliot spoke particularly of an experiment which has been tried in a district in St. Paul where a district office has been made into a settlement house. The district secretary lives there and is carrying on settlement activities as well as case work. A similar experiment is being carried on by the Hebrew Benevolent Society of Baltimore.

The general discussion in the Round Table seemed to indicate that as yet family case workers have done little constructive thinking on the subject of the Family and Its Neighborhood in the light of modern conditions, and that there is a vital need for such thinking and for a program of action in relation to it. A further study of neighborhood influences might well be made in connection with a group of case records and it might also be possible to have special records which would give definite attention

[1] See the December *Survey Graphic*.

to this particular phase of social life. Dr. Eliot's paper suggests some possible approaches to the subject as well as to a better articulation of present trends toward considering the neighborhood not so much as a *locale* as the group or groups in the larger community with which an individual identifies himself.

Conflict in Family Life

THERE is grave danger in setting down the sentiments or even the "sense of the meeting" of a round table of this kind. Statements look permanent in black and white; and to label as conclusions the tentative and scattered remarks of a group absorbed in the discussion of the moment is to lay them open to much misinterpretation. Rather are they to be taken as suggestions and starting points for further thinking.

One achievement of this meeting seems worth mentioning—a freedom and easy flow in the discussion. Occasionally it tended to flow out of bounds, and more than once the tendency of the social worker to give good advice broke through the surface. However, one had the feeling that here was an interested group, trying to further its thinking by free discussion.

From the point of view of four cases of conflict, two of them described at length, the discussion began with an attempt to discover causes—and perhaps remedies. Each situation involved a real conflict between husband and wife; at the beginning abnormal situations arising from calamity, obvious conflicts of totally unsuited personalities, and conflicts involving difficult adjustments between parents and children were ruled out to give more definite limits to the discussion. After rather free questioning and probing for more knowledge of the personalities involved, the discussion seemed more and more to center on the possibility of happiness. A discussion of happiness as a fundamental test of living brought out such questions as, "Are we justified in assuming that happiness is enough?" "May one not get happiness out of the consciousness of contributing to the general welfare in or out of the home?" "Are there women who in getting away from their husbands are getting finer values out of life?" and the suggestions that "happiness exists where the self is really satisfied" and that "happiness is not a simple matter of a good time or of one's social contribution." Satisfaction was suggested as a better term than happiness.

A further discussion of the conflicts described brought the question how far the people themselves were conscious of conflict and the possibilities of adjustment where only one of the two persons involved recognizes the situation. Conflicts may also be related to things outside the immediate family life—profession, social contacts, relatives—and there arises the question of the relationship between satisfactions in the home and those in outside life. A mixing of family and other social satisfactions leads to an expectation of satisfactions in the home which should properly be outside. There is also a danger of mixing up immediate and permanent satisfactions; and some are much more real than others. The fact that before marriage each may feign an interest in what is vital to the other and then, after marriage, their real interests may emerge, may also bring out unforeseen conflicts.

The question as to how far the resolution of conflicts is a matter of sacrifice rather than of integration brought a discussion of the directions in which conflicts might be solved—the social objective of family integrity versus the personal objective of happiness or satisfaction. One suggestion was made that the real point in resolving conflicts is in the development of personality and that mutual development may bring the highest possibilities. This suggested the corollary, "Would it really be to the interest of society if people were happy in the society of today?" recalling the question of happiness, and the suggestion that it does not imply freedom from problems of adjustment.

The social objective of family integrity may not be a sound one, as family life must yield satisfaction to the individual if it is to persist. The family is not necessarily the object we wish to preserve, but rather a creative quality in living. Society has imposed an impossible standard, and family life cannot provide all the satisfactions we have expected from it. The family cannot be the

ultimate test of living, as the interest in the family is for the sake of individual betterment. In a complex society there is more opportunity for interests and there are other emotionally satisfying impulses besides family loyalty.

The leader in closing the discussion spoke of two needs: the first of absolute honesty in facing facts, leaving moral judgments aside; and the second the need for a social setting, really loving considerateness, the sense of a common stake.

Problems of Marriage and Parenthood

SOCIAL case workers are dealing every day with problems of marriage and parenthood, yet in the round table discussions of this particular subject they seemed to bring a general fogginess of thinking that obscured their objectives and hid their actual knowledge of the subject.

There is an interesting duplication in the questions raised in the six group meetings. What do we mean by "a family" came up in each instance but was lost sight of in the discussion of other matters which seem to have aroused more enthusiasm. What is a successful marriage? How far has the economic independence of women brought changes in our attitude toward marriage and the family? How shall we develop the affectional ties of which Professor Ogburn spoke? What part does the conflict between generations play in successful and unsuccessful family life? How shall we educate for marriage and parenthood?

None of the groups seems to have reached any definite conclusions. There were, however, some evident agreements:

(1) That the test of successful family life is in its products. A successful home is one which is not only acceptable to the community but where every member of the family finds opportunity for the development of personality and growth of character. The need for a long time view was emphasized. Evidences of successful family life ought to show all along the way; but sometimes we may have to wait thirty years to make the final test of the effects of family life.

(2) It was generally agreed that there was need for a program of education today, stressing among other things the spirit of service on the part of children. Some felt there was too little expected of children today, and that sacrifice on their part was left out of home training.

Among educational forces the following were mentioned: parent council groups of professional people, working together in study groups; parent-teacher associations; child training committees promoting the study of child welfare; training given in homes for unmarried mothers; classes in settlement houses; the home economics departments of the public schools; courses in parenthood given in schools of adult education; classes in euthenics given at Vassar this summer. Parents and social workers have learned a great deal about child health and child psychology but are wofully weak in the technique of using that knowledge.

(3) The influence of the economic independence of women aroused a good deal of discussion. The feeling that it has affected family life was evident but there was little attempt to analyze this influence or to determine whether it is a healthful or detrimental factor. It was questioned whether, if women could gain their psychological independence as they have gained their economic independence, some of the present conflict in marriage might disappear.

As a concomitant to the discussion of the working mother, nursery schools came up for consideration. Here again there were no conclusions, but a general agreement that, if women are to work outside the home, adequate provision must be made for the care of the children.

Among the many unanswered questions was one as to who should take the lead in promoting the next steps toward improvement in family life and, in particular, the next steps which Miss Richmond outlined in her paper. Perhaps it is unfair to say that this question went entirely unanswered, for each group suggested the need for numerous studies to which case workers might contribute.

How may we as case workers develop affectional ties in families? More attention in case records to those factors which make for satisfaction in family relationships would enable us to contribute to a sound body of knowledge on this subject. Studies of suc-

cessful family life such as were suggested by Professor Groves might well be stimulated by family case workers.

A discussion of the place of sex conflicts in family life brought the suggestion that there was need of further study as to the case worker's responsibility and as to what she shall do with the information she secures in individual cases. It was felt that many workers have no difficulty in getting information but do not know how to use it.

There is need for some detailed studies of instances of sex compatibility as well as instances where incompatibilities have arisen.

There should be further study of the possibility of training young people for marriage and parenthood and the possibility of introducing such subjects in the secondary schools.

It was suggested that a study be made of the relationship between ideals and actual habits of marriage, that is, a correlation between opinions regarding subjects related to marriage and the actual facts. Studies might also be made of groups which have developed unconventional practices related to family relationships.

The leader of one round table expressed his feeling that there is no concern of human beings which ought not to receive the consideration of those human beings. We recognize the necessity of such institutions as the church and state and are willing to experiment with those institutions, but so far no variations with respect to the family and its administration have been tolerated.

All six meetings were undoubtedly stimulating but each question raised made one long for a round table devoted entirely to its discussion. Smaller groups and a delimited topic, so that discussion might explore more intensively a less extensive area and perhaps arrive somewhere, would seem to be an experiment worth trying. To discuss marriage and parenthood in a two-hour session is like trying to encompass the world in sixty minutes. Perhaps that is why the six round tables on the subject ended with less satisfaction than the evident interest would lead one to expect.

SPIRITUAL FACTORS IN FAMILY LIFE[1]

A Minister Listens in at a Round Table Discussion

DR. B. S. WINCHESTER

WHEN an invitation was received to attend the Round Table Discussion on Spiritual Factors in Family Life, which formed one feature of the Buffalo Conference, the minister who received it accepted with alacrity. He regarded the invitation as being perhaps a significant incident. For he shared a little the feeling of some church people that the typical social worker is apt to be rather completely secularized. In his own case the feeling was justified, he thought, as he glanced through the pamphlet "What Social Workers Should Know About Their Own Communities" and failed to find there any reference to the Church or to religion, save the most casual inquiries as to what the churches may be doing for relief, what their recreational programs are, or whether they are united in a church federation. "Just as I thought," he mused, "the church and religion are ignored!"

He was a bit unprepared, therefore, for the suggestion made at the outset that the social workers present share their experience concerning the part which spiritual factors play in social case work. It seemed to be taken for granted that they play *some* part, and indeed an important part.

One person made this confession: "There are times when, in the course of our procedure, it becomes evident that what the family most needs is assistance of a spiritual nature." But the speaker went on to say that, while the doctor, or the lawyer, or the psychiatrist seem to know just what to do when a case is referred to them requiring psychiatric, legal, or medical treatment, when

[1] Including a report of the Round Table on this subject, Wednesday afternoon, October 5, 1927.

the minister is called in he seems often quite at a loss as to what he is to contribute to the situation. He may ask the case worker, "Do you wish me to buy some clothing or send around a ton of coal?" Or, "Does this family need some money to pay for hospital expenses?" When assured that it is not material but spiritual assistance that is needed, he may promise to call, or to invite the family to church, or to send around the church visitor. Sometimes he asks, helplessly, "Just what *do* you want me to do?"

Another bit of testimony brought out the fact that there is a difference in ministers. Many ministers seem to look askance at all scientific social case work as being mechanical, materialistic, and "hard-boiled." There are others who have pursued social studies in college and theological seminary and appreciate the aims and methods employed. They make the mistake, however, of thinking that they are asked in to do the same kind of thing the social worker is doing, rather than to make a distinctive contribution to the spiritual life.

As the discussion progressed the minister began to feel more and more humble, but at the same time more and more interested. He perceived that social workers are, after all, human beings, earnestly at work upon baffling human problems whose solution, in the last analysis, is spiritual. It dawned upon him that social worker and minister are really at work upon the same job; they are seeking by different methods the same objective and must rely upon the same spiritual forces. But too often they speak a different language and so fail to understand each other and to reinforce each other's efforts.

The minister asked himself this question: Why can't we get together and interpret, each to the other, our respective points of view? At this point he was greatly encouraged to hear that this is just what is taking place in some instances. A social worker discovers a minister who is sympathetic and teachable and lays before him the history of the case. Such a history is especially valuable if it contains a description of the religious background of the different members of the family and of their present attitudes, respectively, toward religion. Upon the basis of such information the minister seeks to lay hold upon such religious feelings and aspirations and memories as still persist and awaken once again religious faith and conviction. Minister and social worker together give time and thought and counsel and prayer until at length a new spirit is manifest and the family problem is well on toward solution.

Again, a group of social workers, as in Boston, undertake to develop mutual understanding with a group of ministers through a series of conferences. Each group makes a serious effort to cast aside technical phraseology and to discuss in plain speech the human problems with which both are vitally concerned. Out of such conferences is born a sense of comradeship and an ability to cooperate intelligently.

In some communities, in Toronto for example, the city is organized into district councils. Upon these councils pastors of churches serve, taking their place upon the case committee as well as upon other committees. In this way they are brought into intimate touch with the whole work of the organization and often render most valuable assistance.

All seemed to agree that it is very desirable that ministers should be trained in the theological seminary to render this spiritual service in cases of social need. It was found that some seminaries already are sending out their students to work alongside the social worker in order to gain "laboratory practice" in the technique of this art.

The minister came out of the Round Table Conference with mingled feelings and convictions. In the first place, with a new appreciation and respect for the social worker. Also, with a certain sense of chagrin, not to say "conviction of sin," because of his own inadequacy and that of the church. Here, certainly, is a service which ought not to be left undone, however many other useful undertakings may be attempted.

Yet, with the best of intentions on both sides, it is evident that a wide gulf too often separates the church worker and the social worker. This gulf must be bridged. Mutual acquaintance will help. The minister and the church must gain an understanding of the meaning of case work. The very term hardly occurs in the church vocabulary.

The church needs to realize that there are "cases" which need to be painstakingly studied, problems to be carefully analyzed, and constructive *spiritual* remedies *continuously* applied, over long periods if need be.

The social worker needs to realize that spiritual attitudes and backgrounds need to be included in the diagnosis and case history. Probably one reason why ministers are often "at a loss to know what to do" is to be found in the absence of reference in the case worker's record to the spiritual aspects of the case. When the services of a minister are desired it is due him that the record should reveal the relation which spiritual factors sustain to the other phases of the family problem.

And, finally, case worker and minister must both realize that they are collaborators. The case worker cannot turn over the spiritual task to the minister and be absolved of further responsibility. Whether he will or no, the case worker is, and must remain, a factor in the working out of the spiritual task. On the other hand, the minister must realize his dependence upon the experience and skill of the social worker. As they thus work together mutual acquaintance and appreciation of each other's part in a common project will grow and we may expect as a result that there will gradually evolve a technique for minister and church worker to supplement that of the social worker. It is a hopeful feature of the situation that both are beginning to realize their mutual dependence. Patience, sympathy, and cooperation will accomplish great things in time.

THE VOLUNTEER — A PARADOX[1]

ELLEN WINDOM WARREN GEER

"A PARADOX, a paradox, a most ingenious paradox!" Gilbert and Sullivan's haunting refrain rings persistently in my ears when I study the reports from the six Round Tables on Volunteers at the Conference on Family Life in America Today at Buffalo. The secretary of one of our large city societies is responsible for this jingle running in my head because of the pertinence of the challenge she made at my round table. "We have all," she said, "been talking in a patronizing way of what we shall give the volunteer to do, of how much responsibility we can educate the board member to assume, and talking throughout as professionals looking down upon volunteers from higher ground. At the same time we have been asserting that volunteers are the bone and sinew of our societies, that without the volunteer roots in the community it would be impossible for us to function. Is this not a paradoxical situation?"

This it is indeed; and that we are far from having evolved a satisfactory adjustment of our volunteer beginnings to our professional present becomes undeniable upon studying the Buffalo material. In addition to the reports on the discussions we have much valuable data assembled previous to the conference from questionnaires which were filled out and sent in from 106 societies scattered throughout the country and from personal letters from 35 representative volunteers. Although most of it consists in pleas for more light on ramifications of the problem, many valuable contributions were contained in the questionnaires, letters, and discussions.

Perhaps the most valuable of these was one which was suggested by several of the letters from volunteers, and which was the only recommendation that was endorsed by all of the six round tables participating in the discussions at Buffalo. This was the belief that professional schools of social work should include in their training of students a conscious treatment of the value, use, and training of volunteers. One of the leaders in social case work in the country advocated that this be included in the course on agency administration, thus making clear to the students that volunteers are an integral part of their organization and should be considered as of equal importance with their professional staff workers. That such a conscious effort on the part of social work

[1] This article includes the reports of the Six Round Tables on The Volunteer in Social Case Work, held Monday afternoon, October 3, 1927.

training schools would do much to prevent the present misunderstanding attitude of certain professional workers was pretty well evidenced by the fact that several questionnaires from societies mentioned that the intolerance was usually manifested by the younger workers who were recent school graduates. Apparently the experience of the older workers had taught them the value of volunteers, but the emphasis of the school upon technique and the intricacy of this field of social work had led the young workers to regard volunteers as useless nuisances. A further proof of the necessity of this early training came out in the discussion when workers who had trained in a certain city long noted for its volunteer traditions testified that no matter where they went they tried to organize corps of volunteers, so indispensable did they feel them to be.

The marked divergence between agencies of different sizes in the answers to the preliminary study was an interesting side light on this question of the professional's attitude toward the volunteer. In cities with a population of 450,000 and over, 5 societies expressed themselves as enthusiastic, 4 as qualifiedly endorsing volunteers, and 2 as discouraged. In cities from 100,000 to 300,000 population, 17 out of 31 were enthusiastic, 7 qualified their approval, and 7 were definitely disapproving; while in cities under 100,000, 20 out of 44 were enthusiastic, 9 discouraged, and 15 definitely disapproving. No one fact gleaned from the preliminary study seemed as important as this: not one of the eleven large cities definitely disapproved of volunteers, while one third of the societies in smaller centers not only disapproved but, as other answers showed, do not use them. The reason is not as far to seek as is the solution of the difficulty. The insufficient and overworked staffs in the smaller societies, who of course are the very ones who ideally should gain the most from volunteers, have not the time necessary to recruit and supervise volunteers, which in turn deprives the community of its normal interpreters and so prevents their realizing the need of raising more money to increase the staff. That in spite of difficulties of having small staffs it is possible to use volunteers to advantage in small societies is brought out by the experience of several of the latter. One, founded as recently as 1915 in a town of 20,000, uses 30 active volunteers, over half of whom are also board members, while another in a town of 6000, dating only from 1912, uses 35 volunteers for definite pieces of work, including the preparation of the annual report, weekly publicity for the newspaper, and so on, and 75 more for a thrift shop from which recruits are drawn for the more serious work. There is quite a contrast between such experiences as these, coupled with the testimony of another who says, "Having only one paid worker I could not get along without volunteers," and such remarks as, "Have tried to use volunteers from time to time with no success at all"; "They do more harm than good"; "They undo what has already been done"; "They are too dangerous unless experienced." Nobody denies that some volunteers may justify such opinions, but where lies the blame? Partly on the volunteer, certainly, but is the professional who accepted and supervised her entirely exempt? The contrast between these exceptional smaller societies and the others seems a fresh proof of the desirability of training professional workers in the use of volunteers. Still another commentary on the value of such an inclusion in the curricula of professional schools is found in the enthusiasm expressed by all agencies who have experimented with having a designated and trained member of their staff concentrate on the recruiting and supervising of volunteers. Two societies use gifted volunteers on half time for this work; while a number said they have successfully made certain volunteers responsible for the recruiting of all their volunteers.

"Professionals must lead," asserts one executive at a round table, "but we must allow the volunteer free play for developing his initiative and for bringing in the enrichment which his outside point of view can give us." Here is another hint as to a means of solving our original paradox. Could we gain by having a conscious, although extremely elastic, division of labor between professional and volunteer? In saying this, I have not forgotten the numerous warnings at Buffalo against having a doctrinaire spirit

about this whole matter, nor the many who felt that the training and service of volunteer and professional should be kept as nearly similar as possible. This apparent conflict between the danger of being doctrinaire and my desire to clarify the services each can render is caused I think by a lack of certainty as to what we mean when we speak of a volunteer. If we are discussing only the young woman who can give half time or over to her work, we can all agree whole heartedly that the only sensible method of procedure is to urge her to take regular courses in schools of social work, to exact from her the same standards we expect from our professional students, to require her attendance at staff meetings, and to draw no line between her work and the work of the regular staff. But what we can reasonably expect from this type of volunteer it would be absurd to exact from the middle-aged woman who gives invaluable service on a district committee, is thoroughly "sold" on the value of case work, and is a splendid interpreter of our ideals to the community, but has no time for active field work. Still a third type of volunteer exists who must be treated in still another way. This is the person who can give only a small amount of time but is responsible and regular, willing to take elementary training and to perform certain of the non-case work tasks of our organizations. Case work aids, clerical workers, transportation and shop workers are some of the many members of this third class, who obviously have not the time, nor often the ability, to be trained in a manner similar to our professional staffs. Is not one of the causes of our bewilderment about this whole topic that in writings and discussions one will often find advocated a theory intended to be applied to *one* of these three types of volunteers, which the reader, because of our loose use of the term, assumes is applicable to all volunteers? The apparent disagreement between those who believe in treating volunteers like professionals and those who believe special tasks and training should be evolved for volunteers, is, it seems to me, caused by this very misunderstanding as to which kind of volunteer is under discussion.

Therefore, even at risk of being doctrinaire, I humbly suggest that an effort be made to define the volunteer as one who gives service in co-operation with an agency, and further that we outline roughly three classes of volunteers, keeping the division non-rigid and hoping that frequently volunteers will move from one class to another. An attempt at some such classification was made at one round table, but proved abortive when it came to the point of trying to christen any of the divisions (although that volunteers are divided in some such way was admitted by most of the participants). The perfect names are hard to find, and will perhaps be suggested by some of the readers of this article. For want of better, let us temporarily entitle them *volunteer advisors* (board and committee members and less formal advisory volunteers); *volunteer aids* (clerical, transportation, etc.); and *volunteer case workers* (implying that professional standard and training without which case work cannot be done). The elusive name for this last class is especially hard to find; it should define more clearly the professional nature of such (rare) volunteers.

Granting then, gladly, that our volunteer case workers should be treated like the regular staff, can we not get from our advisory volunteers and from our volunteer aids more initiative and enrichment than we now do, by thinking out clearly in our own minds what the volunteer has to give which the professional has not, by dividing roughly the tasks which lie before us, assigning to each the ones she can do best, realizing always that while the executive must lead, the rewards of interesting volunteers to give of their best thought will be rich? All too often volunteer aids are given some task which could develop their thinking along original lines, but which fails of doing so because of an attitude of discouragement. Even the typing of case records, with a little effort, can be made into a critical study of some phase of each case (first reading the previous entries), thus training the volunteer even a little in method and getting from her the benefit of whatever suggestions her fresh point of view may lead her to make. Similarly, I wonder how many societies do with their transportation aids what one society does to avoid wasting the time of volunteer

and professional alike while in transit. Whenever possible the worker describes to her driver the case she is about to visit, giving the situation as fully as there is time, explaining the purpose of this special call, and of course reporting on its success or failure when she returns from the visit. In this way a real contact, second hand to be sure but none the less intimate, can be made by the volunteer with the detailed case work of the society, and it is said that often these transportation aids become volunteer case workers later on. Even if they do not, it is easy to see the increased value of their ability to interpret the society's program to their friends.

In this connection, let me urge a fuller utilization of advisory volunteers in new lines. Several members of round tables expressed the feeling that board members and money raisers were treated as a class apart and should not be asked to do any active work. If my rough classification should do anything to further this feeling, it would defeat the very purpose for which I made it. It is because I feel that, if we talk about professional standards for classes of volunteers who obviously cannot attain them, we will miss out on developing the tremendous potentialities which they can attain, that I have repeated the attempt of my round table to classify three types of volunteer service. A well known leader and writer on family case work expressed what I have in mind, when he said that we should accustom ourselves to draw upon the experience of life possessed by our volunteers in the same way that we utilize the specialized training of our staff workers. This was further developed by another outstanding figure in our field, who advocated the keeping of a card catalog of all the affiliations and advantages of each of our volunteers, to be consulted liberally when in need of advice about specific problems.[2] Others reported such original lines of volunteer assistance as advice to working girls on buying clothes, housekeeping advice, utilization of cultural advantages by teaching, encouraging, or advising artistically talented clients, tutoring children who were backward or adults who had never had the schooling they longed for; and finally the ingenious idea of drawing upon the nationality knowledge of so many widely travelled volunteers to assist in understanding foreign clients. Certainly such individual consultation on definite problems can do more than any other one thing to keep the interest of the board member vital and valuable.

That board members as a whole are not content to relapse into rubber stamps, and that the societies do use them in many ways, is shown by an interesting table drawn up from the questionnaires. The societies were asked to mention what services they received from their directors in addition to attendance at meetings, and the most frequently mentioned were divided as follows:

Service	*Number of Societies Receiving Service*		
	Over 450,000	*100,000 to 300,000*	*Under 100,000*
Interpretation	8	10	12
Policy Decisions	0	7	6
Finance Responsibility	3	6	6
Visiting Families	0	0	7
Advising on Cases	7	3	0

The fact that none of the large cities mention policy decisions as a function of directors is interesting, and may well mean that not enough attention has been directed toward preventing predigested questions coming up at board meetings for routine decision. When this point was discussed at Buffalo, several agencies testified that, in order to avoid this, they had boldly abolished their executive committees and now brought everything directly to the entire board for decision. It is also noteworthy, though not surprising, that the small cities do not use their directors for advising on cases, but do use them for visiting, while the larger cities reverse the process. In connection with the best known function of the board member—that of acting as interpreter to and from the community—it is significant that, while most of the societies mentioned the benefit of having them to transmit the outgoing message from agency to public, very few commented on the benefit they could gain from feeling the pulse of the community by the message the volunteers could bring *in*. My own experience is that most professional workers do

[2] See also *Case Work and the Community*, Report of a Committee of the 1926 Institute of Family Social Work, available, free, from the American Association for Family Social Work, 130 E. 22 St., New York.

not begin to understand the hopelessly non-caring or antagonistic attitude of too many of our lay public, and it is difficult for a volunteer to speak of this unless she is encouraged definitely to do so.

One suggestion for keeping up the board members' intimate contact with the work of the society was to have them serve on case committees—three directors for periods of three months each. Much attention was given to case conferences; most of those who attended the round tables felt that they are valuable as a means of educating volunteers, although their possibilities are not lived up to always by those who plan the program. Again we must remember our Gilbert and Sullivan paradox, however; are we educating volunteers to serve only as interpreters, or are we remembering what we can get from them? As one round table member put it: "Are volunteers a means or are they an end?" A few raised the question as to whether volunteers can know enough to interpret social work. One might agree that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and yet feel that this little knowledge is what is possessed by the average serious critic of social work, and that the volunteer's additional experience makes him a necessary intermediary between the critic who knows too little and the expert who knows too much to make himself readily understood by the average layman. Much should be done, it was felt, in making volunteers realize their own responsibility, not only to do their own work well, but also to interpret the ideals of social work to their community. Too often, when this is overlooked, a dissatisfied volunteer can become a most dangerous though perhaps unconscious enemy. Again we realize the enormous importance of impressing such facts upon our young workers-in-training! Another good bit of advice to staffs was offered by a professional who asked them to think back over their own experience as volunteers in other agencies or fields.

So much interest was shown in recruiting volunteers that I am glad to be able to give some information from the reports which may help agencies who are struggling with the fundamental problem of where to get the volunteers to treat! Various possible sources were suggested in the questionnaire and the societies were asked to indicate which ones were most successful. The large cities listed them in the following order (not unanimously, of course; this ranking was determined by a careful computation of the returns from the eleven large cities):

(1) Present volunteers
(2) Churches, clubs, Junior Leagues
(3) Staff contacts
(4) Speaking to selected groups
(5) Case work contacts
(6) Colleges and schools
(7) Newspaper appeals
(8) Donors

The medium-sized cities put churches, clubs and Junior Leagues first, which is perhaps due to the smaller number of demands made upon them and their readier accessibility, while the small societies put this source fifth upon their list (having fewer of them probably), and ranked staff contacts ahead of the volunteer contacts, possibly on account of the more intimate relation between staff worker and community in the smaller city. Case work contacts ranked third in the small cities, which is also interesting. (The same method of evaluation was used in computing the rankings for the medium and smaller societies but, except for the differences just noted, their success with the various methods of recruiting seemed sufficiently uniform with the larger cities to obviate the necessity for giving all the figures.) One wonders, upon studying this table, why colleges and schools do not prove more effective sources for volunteers. Are we perhaps failing to use them in the right way? It is curious to note that (replying to another question) all the large cities which have a central bureau for recruiting and placement approve of it, while almost all of the smaller societies, not having such a bureau, fear it and express disapproval of such a scheme.

In recruiting it is helpful to know what types of persons are apt to prove most successful as volunteers, and the replies as to the age groups from which the societies have had the most success in recruiting are rather significant. In the cities of 450,000 population and over, the age groups fell in the following order according to their success in supplying volunteers:

Young married women
Older women
Young unmarried women
Young men
Girls under 20
Older men

The 100,000-300,000 population group puts young unmarried women first, young married women second, older women third, and older men ahead of girls under twenty; while the small cities repeat the preference for young unmarried women first, but give older women the advantage over young married women. This divergence seems rather puzzling as one would expect the young married women to be most useful in small towns. Is it not perhaps an indication of the failure of some of the staffs of small societies to utilize as volunteers groups which are more difficult to fit in, but more valuable when they can be interested? Another striking result of this table is the very low ranking accorded to men. This is not a healthy sign, and certainly much attention should be directed to methods of interesting them. A Canadian society reported at Buffalo that a group of ex-service men, recruited right after the war, is still active in the society, while a number of societies have had very good success with evening committees of men recruited because of some special interest in district or nationality problems.

Some participants at the round table questioned whether, with the increased technicality and specialization of family case work, we are not reaching a point where volunteers can no longer be used. Here again it seems to me we are confusing the issue because of our loose treatment of the term volunteer. Certainly untrained, irregular volunteers cannot be turned loose on our clients but, by roughly assigning each volunteer in our own minds to one of the three classes above mentioned, would it not be possible to use anyone whose seriousness of intent and willingness to conform to the requirements of his specific job came up to our standards? Volunteer case workers, trained and giving large blocks of time, are certainly rare nowadays, as is proved by the fact that they received the lowest place with the societies who listed the types of volunteer service they used. But admitting that this one class of volunteer service is increasingly hard to fill need not blind us to the benefits we can still gain from the volunteer advisors of whom we have spoken and from the volunteer aids. Many general and specific suggestions were made at Buffalo on this question, one of the best being the reminder of Miss Zilpha Smith's motto for staff workers: "Never do yourself what a good volunteer can do." In the old days the reason for such a motto may have been primarily the necessity of proving to the public the value of salaried staffs and minimizing the apparent extravagance of this innovation. Even if this reason no longer applies, surely the motto itself still holds good as a counsel to staff workers to gain from volunteers something they themselves lack, and at the same time free themselves from time-consuming tasks which prevent them from fulfilling their mission as leaders. Lest this also appear paradoxical (the giving of dull routine tasks not being the most conducive way of arousing the intelligent interest of a volunteer) let us remember the use of typists and transportation aids mentioned before, and try to apply the same principle to other types of otherwise dull jobs. Shop work was vitalized by one society by having the staff workers tell the volunteer shop keepers something of the clients who came to them to buy. They report that frequently the interest of the shop workers was so aroused in this way that they transferred to the active case working field.

For that most difficult but often valuable type of volunteer whose home duties prevent her from controlling her time to conform to rigid schedules, two valuable suggestions were made at Buffalo which merit experiment by anyone interested in this whole question. The first is an effort to modernize the old idea of friendly visitors by borrowing from the big brother and big sister movement the successful principle of interesting an individual volunteer in a similar individual client. Thus a young mother could become vitally interested in the problems of another young mother, even though the two might normally not have come together. Or an older woman, whose health prevents her from exacting tasks, could do much to enlighten a woman of her own age, who has broken down, been forced to give

up her job, and is for the first time accepting an allowance from the family society. By educating these volunteer friends to some elementary knowledge of case work, they should be able to serve as invaluable assistants to the staffs in supplying the long term, intensive friendly contact on chronic, "hopeless," or closed cases, reporting to the staff any changes or new conditions before they progress far enough to be dangerous. By choosing for their friends persons of their own age and experience we should not only be utilizing the principle of drawing on the life experience of volunteers as a substitute for technical training, but we should also avoid some of the dangers inherent in the old way of using friendly visitors. That friendly visitors are far from being a dead issue today, as many believe, is shown by the fact that one large city uses 171 with marked success, and that they are used more than any other type of volunteer except transportation aids in the small cities.

The other suggestion was to have certain volunteers act as referees on the decisions of the case conferences. This has been successfully tried in London, where every decision is referred to a volunteer who studies the entire record (not knowing the discussion of the committee), and passes on the decision after bringing to the problem a fresh mind. If she disagrees she has to explain her reasons to the committee. Not only is this intensely stimulating to better discussion by the committee, but it should also prove a valuable method of training volunteers in case work method when they cannot go out personally into the field.

A practical hint came from one society where the district secretary makes a point of pinning to the wall a list of the jobs available at that particular time for volunteers to do. In that way she is never at a loss when a volunteer comes in—a danger which the letters from volunteers testify is at the root of many resignations and failures. From the diversity of positions occupied by volunteers it might well pay all supervisors to give time and thought to such a list. Among less well known jobs listed by agencies are: sewing, auditing, shop work, community work, extension work, clinic aids, tutoring, Christmas shopping, Christmas telephoning, legal aid, musical work, Americanization, handling complaints, and so on.

Of the four most widely used types of volunteer aids, it is interesting to note the difference in use in the cities of varying sizes. In the large cities they are used as follows: friendly visitors, most; clerical workers, second; case work aids, third; and transportation aids, fourth. In the medium-sized cities, transportation aids come first; clerical, second; friendly visitors, third; and case work aids, fourth. In the small cities transportation aids again come first; friendly visitors, second; case work aids, third; and clerical workers fourth. The great use of transportation aids in small cities makes one hope that their staffs utilize this contact for informal education of their volunteer chauffeurs, and help them to realize their own possibilities as interpreters. And what a marvelous chance for the workers to get advice on specific cases while en route! (It should be noted that friendly visitors would not have reached first place in the large city group but for the one society which uses 171.)

That the most important education of volunteers is the day-by-day supervision by and contact with the professional worker was made apparent by questionnaires, letters from volunteers, and discussions alike. How tremendously vital then becomes some training of the trainers! In the smaller centers the education the volunteer receives is almost exclusively of this informal sort, with occasional successful experiments with reading lists, discussion groups, participation in staff conferences, planned consecutive programs for district conferences, and so on. One very small society reported a most successful combination study group made up of board members and active volunteers, who studied together the lectures in *The Art of Helping,* discussing the principles raised in conjunction with some of the society's own cases illustrative of those principles.

The large cities find that more formal training in courses with varying rigidity of standard not only creates better volunteer service, but serves as an effective means of recruiting. Several cities giving such courses use newspapers to announce them, and many volunteers usually come in as a

result. Most of these classes require some field work in conjunction with the class work; and many commented on the vital necessity of sympathetic supervision following the course, one volunteer advocating that the teacher also act as supervisor where possible. An ingenious solution of the insufficient staff problem in supervising is suggested by the experiment of having volunteers concentrated on one day, which may upset the case work for that day, but which enables careful planning of suitable tasks and more conscious supervisory education. In this particular case the volunteers all stay for the case conference, and there is a splendid feeling of group solidarity.

Do all these suggestions and findings get us anywhere with our original paradox? If volunteers are an integral part of our social work structure, obviously they should not be looked down upon by the staff. Yet if they are not of real value to the society it is hard to avoid this attitude of condescension. Is not the remedy then to raise standards of volunteer service by giving volunteers proper and suitable education, to raise standards of supervision and co-operation on the part of the staff by incorporating training along these lines in the schools of social work, and finally by recognizing new opportunities for volunteers to replace those which the professional alone can perform? If anything in this article helps any society along one of these three lines of endeavor, then indeed the work of the staffs and volunteers in compiling this material, of the Committee in evaluating it, and of all those who sweltered through two hours of discussion at Buffalo will not have been in vain.

The most encouraging feature of the Buffalo conference as a whole was the note of courage and hope for the future. This was evident in the way that almost all our round tables ended on a note of challenge rather than of finality. Far from feeling that the studies or discussions have concluded anything, we felt that we are on the verge of new discoveries and experiments along this line which may be as important to family case work as some of the new developments in technique which are being perfected. It is the hope of the Committee that its work is not over; that all who attended the Conference or who read this report will feel free to send in any comments, criticisms, suggestions, or descriptions of new experiments concerning volunteers. Through the machinery of the Association of Volunteers in Social Service in co-operation with the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, such additional data can be studied and made available to others, if anyone having any ideas to express will only send them in to THE FAMILY, or to one of the associations mentioned above.

In our particular field of social work there is no alarming sentiment that volunteer service is no longer needed, as there is in some other fields, but we do need to develop a keener realization of the dangers threatening the continuance of the right kind of volunteer service. It is up to all of us to guard against these dangers by carrying the enthusiastic, forward-looking spirit of the Buffalo conference into our dealing with this, as with other developments which will undoubtedly be forthcoming during the next fifty years of the family social case work movement.

THE CHANGING BASIS OF FAMILY SUPPORT AND EXPENDITURE[1]

PAUL H. DOUGLAS
University of Chicago

I.

THE nature of the family, like that of every other human institution, has largely been shaped by the economic conditions of the time. Its form changes in part as the ways in which men make a living change, and it in turn helps to shape economic institutions themselves. One great change has come with modern industrialism—namely the fact that the men and women who are gainfully employed now make their living as individuals and not as members of a family group. In a pastoral society this, of course, is not so. The need

[1] Given Wednesday morning, October 5, 1927.

for many shepherds, for protection and for insurance, leads to the patriarchal family with its attendant subordination of women and the younger men. Over most of the earth agriculture is even today managed on a family basis. The labor of husband, wife, and children all dovetails, and the goods which are thus produced are shared by all. As long as manufacturing is primarily carried on in the home, as is the case under the domestic or putting-out system, the family remains the dominant producing agent. In such societies as these, it is virtually impossible for a woman to make a living by herself. In order to survive she must attach herself to some family. The lot of a spinster is hard; to avoid it women are forced to make early marriages and, once married, there is little or no opportunity for them to escape from uncongenial relationships. But in the highly differentiated societies which the factory system brings in its wake, men and women are employed outside the home as individuals. The factory, the railroad, the office, and the large store are not enterprises which are carried on by men and women bound together by a common blood tie and by a common home, but by people whose associations need not extend beyond their working hours, and who earn their living purely as individuals. In Western civilization, therefore, the family has virtually disappeared as the producing unit.

It still remains, however, as the dominant consuming unit. While an increasing per cent of the money income of the world is being spent by individuals upon themselves, probably the major portion is still expended collectively by some representative of the family to satisfy the group needs of its members.

But there are many who believe that the family, as such, will largely disappear as the consuming unit as well, and that men and women will in the future live together as individuals rather than as members of a family group. It is obvious that there are many forces which are operating in this direction. The possibility of being paid for their work as individuals and thus of maintaining themselves has enabled multitudes of women to escape from distasteful family relationships. Young men and women are able to leave their own families at an earlier age than formerly, and women have been given an alternative to marriage. They are thus not driven into such forced marital relationships as when they were afraid of becoming despised spinsters, seeking sanctuary in the homes of their fathers and their brothers. Industrialism has therefore on the whole raised the age of marriage.

It has also, of course, increased divorce. It is not alone the typewriter which has given to women that "twelve-pound look" which Barrie has described. The ever-widening range of employments makes it possible for wives to leave their husbands and to dissolve relationships which have become irksome. Nor is it as necessary now, as for Barrie's women, previously to have accumulated the twelve pounds. The woman worker need not bring capital with her—she need only bring herself. It is primarily for this reason that divorce is much higher in the cities than in the rural districts.

Just as the opportunities for trade and for handicraft production made of mediaeval cities islands of freedom amidst a sea of serfdom to which bondsmen might flee for liberty, so the industrialism of our modern cities has made of them places of refuge and of adventure to which women, and to a lesser degree young men, may flee from the real or fancied tyranny of parental control and from many of the compulsions of forced matrimony. The increasing ability of women to stand economically upon their own feet has in turn made men more willing to break off marriage ties. To cast a woman adrift in an agricultural society is indeed to abandon the helpless. Chivalry and social pressure therefore combine to make at least the economic maintenance of one's wife an obligation which none can violate with impunity. But this obligation is lessened when women can largely support themselves, with the result that men as well as women can now seek freedom from marriage. Some of the effects which the entrance of women into industry, on approximately the same terms as men, may have on marriage are strikingly evidenced by the developments in Russia, where I am writing these lines. Divorce is possible not only by mutual consent, but virtually at the will of either party, subject only to the provision that if either party later becomes economically dependent, then

the other is liable for support up to one-third of his or her income. A man, therefore, cannot safely be divorced more than twice. The forces which have led to this change are primarily the growth of industrialism and the increased protection which the new regime has provided for children as compared with that of the old government. It is, of course, too soon to appraise all of the consequences of this extraordinary experiment, but there is quite general agreement that it has caused the peasants and the workmen to be more solicitous for the welfare of their wives lest otherwise they should lose them. Wife-beating, for example, is no longer as common as it formerly was, since the wives can now leave their husbands and go to the cities for work. The desire of the men to retain an unpaid worker forces them to be more humane in their treatment of their wives. Women have therefore gained not only greater freedom, but better treatment.

But while the future may well bring to us a greater rate of change in family relationships, it is idle to believe that the family as such will either disappear or that its importance will be greatly lessened. If the worst were to come to the worst and the most divisive of the tendencies of the modern world were to realize themselves, then it would still be true that a series of temporary marriages would nevertheless be marriages. The attraction which men and women feel for one another and their desire for comradeship is such that the maintenance by them of any large proportion of separate households is extremely unlikely.

But the gloomy prophets of the dissolution of marriage err most in forgetting the powerful forces which operate toward the permanency of relations between men and women. Such critics generally forget the simple fact that even in an age of birth control, children are still the normal consequence of marriage. Now the care of children is, with all its difficulties, one which most parents will not willingly confide to any institution. It brings with it joys which the vast majority of men and women will not forego, and it constitutes the most vital tie which permanently binds the interests of men and women together. It is well for the children that this is so, for the experiments of a half-century of child-placing have demonstrated that even the mediocre foster home is better for children than the scientifically managed institution. If this is true in the case of orphans, how much more is it true where the affections of the parents do not start from scratch, but where there is an initial love and where the daily identification of similarities between themselves and their children constantly enhances the feeling of identity. The belief, therefore, in the complete superiority of institutional over home care, which I find many of the Russian Communists hold, seems ill-advised. When to all this is added the greater psychic stabilization of the emotional life of children which permanent as opposed to shifting parental relationships bring, the necessity for as great a permanence of the family as is consistent with other ends is evident. There is need, therefore, as Count Keyserling remarks, for the solemn realization that the family is an agency for the fulfillment of a social duty to the generation which is to press upon us, and not something to be assumed or discarded as one's desires may happen to lead.

Happily also there are other forces than the love and care of children which operate in favor of permanence. In the first place, if one may inject material considerations at this point, it is economical. There are cooperative economies of consumption in family life, and a series of shifting alliances is a luxury which only the well-to-do can afford. From the standpoint of society, moreover, any decrease in the permanence of the relations between men and women would result in a great increase in those self-regarding expenditures which courtship always entails, and which constitute a drain upon the material resources and vital energies of a world where the economic basis of the good life has not been assured as yet to the great masses of mankind.

In the second place, it is frequently overlooked that men and women also hunger for permanence in their relationships with each other as well as for change. In a world in which the physical composition of matter is ceaselessly in flux, and where human institutions and relationships change with what at times seems almost kaleidoscopic rapidity, the human heart seeks to find some resting

place and some state of permanent equilibrium in the midst of the pressures and strains which beat in upon it. This is the mutual need which marriage serves.

I would apologize for mentioning these perfectly obvious forces, were it not for the fact that large groups of our society, including many of our intellectuals, seem to have forgotten them; for matters of marriage and of the family, therefore, the saying of Dr. Johnson that "men need not so much to be informed as to be reminded" seems pre-eminently appropriate, and to justify what would otherwise have been taken for granted.

We are faced, then, with the fact that the family as a consuming unit will, in all probability, continue indefinitely, but that in the future increasingly large numbers of men and women will earn their living as individuals. This dichotomy between income and expenditure, between the individualistic ways in which people earn their living and the largely combined way in which they must expend it, if the family is to be maintained, gives rise to many interesting problems, which I shall now try to explore.

II.

The individualization of the ways in which those who work outside the home receive their money income has made it difficult for families adequately to support themselves. It is not merely necessary that the total earnings of the members of the family should be sufficient to maintain the group, but it is also necessary that they should turn a sufficient amount over to the wife or mother for her to expend for the needed collective purposes. The turning over of one's pay check intact is a virtue which the wives of working men have come to regard as the test of a proper husband, and which they try to enforce by every means in their power. So ardent is this desire that it even gives rise amongst our immigrant population to folk-myths as a weapon of enforcement, as Jane Addams has so charmingly shown in her story of the devil-baby at Hull House.

But this control by the wives is by no means perfect. Many husbands deduct considerable sums from their pay and spend it for their own purposes. This is particularly easy to do in a period when money earnings are changing rapidly, and when it is difficult for wives to keep track of what their husbands are really earning. Many husbands, while turning over their pay to their wives, will almost immediately borrow back from them inordinate sums for personal expenditures. Furthermore, even the steadiest of husbands generally feel that any bonus earnings which they secure over and above their basic wage belong to them and not to their families. Piece-rate workers frequently request that their bonus earnings be paid them in separate envelopes in order that their wives may not know how much they are earning.

But if there are difficulties in getting husbands to contribute to the common fund, they are on the whole much less than those in getting employed children to contribute. The girls are of course more docile than the boys, and frequently give a larger fraction of their earnings to their mothers than do their fathers. Where they are super-conscientious, they all too often stint themselves to protect their younger brothers and sisters. When they are pleasure-loving, however, they frequently absorb most of their earnings for their own purposes. As all know, however, the sons will make fewer sacrifices. Accustomed as most males are to regard themselves as the center of the universe, they tend to be unwilling to sacrifice themselves for the family group as a whole. If great pressure is put upon them by their parents, they can always leave home and keep their earnings entirely for themselves. They are held in the home by the co-operative economies which they largely secure from the unpaid labors of their mother, and for which they would have to pay outside, and also by affection, but if they are forced to contribute so much that it is economically disadvantageous for them to remain, then their family affection is subjected to a severe strain, and a large percentage will leave. The fact that this alternative is always open to them, and to a lesser degree to the daughters as well, operates in turn to moderate the demands which their parents can make upon them.

The result is that the young, particularly the unmarried, men live upon a much more expensive scale than others of their eco-

nomic class. It is primarily they who buy the silk shirts, patronize the pool-rooms, and attend the prize-fights and baseball games. A very large part of the luxurious expenditure of the nation is indeed made by them.

The fact that men get accustomed when bachelors to these expenditures makes it very difficult for them to economize properly once they are married and when two or more persons must share approximately the same income. The result is that a considerable proportion of these expenditures are continued by the husband and father while the income available for the rest of the family is appreciably reduced.

These forces operate, therefore, to prevent the basic needs of many families from being met, even though the money income of its members would, if pooled, be sufficient to meet their needs. The weight of the burden, of course, is thrown upon the wives and younger children. The most over-worked and exploited members of our society are indeed the working-class mothers of two or more children. They in general cut their consumption of food and clothing far below the level of decency and efficiency. Their working day is much longer than that of their husbands and their employed children and has few of the diversions which they enjoy. We have properly been concerned, during the last two decades, with the protection against exploitation of the women who work in stores and factories. But because of their isolation, we have tended to forget the lot of mothers in the home, and to ignore the fact that the kitchen stoves and the washtubs of the home are in practice worse tyrants than the spindles and punch-presses of industry. The protection of these almost forgotten women is indeed one of the most pressing problems of social reform, and is all the more baffling because, since they are not employed for wages, no such direct frontal attack can be made in the form of legislation concerning hours as is possible in the case of their gainfully employed sisters.

But there are many cases where the wages of the family, even if properly expended, are insufficient to meet the vital needs of its members. In industry, workers are paid according to their assumed productivity, and without regard to their needs. If a bachelor is as efficient as the father of a family, then the competition of the market tends to give him as high a wage. The result is that the average earnings of unskilled labor, which, even with no loss from unemployment, cannot exceed $1,100 a year, are insufficient to maintain even one dependent child, and greatly less than those needed to support two or more such children. The families of the semi-skilled workers are only slightly better off. There is therefore a large section of our children who are growing up under cramped conditions which will permanently handicap them.

Most of the proponents of the living wage principle have sought to meet this difficulty by proposing that all adult male workers shall be paid enough to support a family of five, which for some occult reason they have assumed as the standard or normal sized family. But this is a wrong method of accomplishing a right end. The occupation statistics of England, the United States, and Australia all demonstrate that slightly over one-quarter of the adult males who are gainfully employed are bachelors. They certainly do not have wives and children to support, and it costs them less than half as much to live upon the same scale as it does a family with three dependent children. To pay them enough to support such a family would therefore be to give them a surplus greatly in excess of their needs for a basic minimum even with an allowance of a saving for matrimony. Approximately one-quarter of the male workers, moreover, while married do not have any children dependent upon them for support, and hence would also enjoy a considerable surplus. Approximately another 30 per cent of the workers have one or two children to support, and hence do not need as much as the family of five. Thus 80 per cent of all the males have less than four persons dependent upon them while only slightly less than 10 per cent actually have the family which we have been told is the standard. The single men and those with small families have been tacitly willing, if we may mix our metaphors, to fight behind the skirts of their married brethren but they should no more be allowed to plead the existence of other people's children as a reason for increasing their own wages than street beggars to borrow children

who do not belong to them in order to make their own appeal to charity more effective.

Ten per cent in turn have more than three children dependent upon them, and would still be insufficiently provided for were all to be paid the family-of-five wages. These 10 per cent, significantly enough, have from 35 to 40 per cent of the children to support. To pay to all workers enough to support a family of five would thus be exactly to meet the needs of only one-tenth of the workers, to pour vast surpluses into the pockets of eight-tenths, and still to stint another tenth. Since there were, in 1920, 28.2 million adult male workers, slightly over six million of adult women who were gainfully employed, and about an equal number of employed juveniles, to pay to the males enough to support five persons each would be to provide them with maintenance for 141 million persons. But since the total population of the country in that year was less than 106 millions, and since the women and juveniles certainly on the whole earn enough to support themselves, there are not more than 94 million persons, including the men themselves, who must be supported by the male workers. To pay the family of five wage to all would, therefore, be to provide for 47 million fictitious persons. This burden of supporting so many non-existent wives and children would be too heavy for many industries to bear, so that even in prosperous America it is in fact doubtful whether it would be economically possible for the family of five wage to be universally applied.

We would seem then to be confronted with a dilemma: since payment is made according to production, and since the composition of families varies greatly, how then is it possible for us to adapt our wage system in such a way as to provide an economic sufficiency for the children of the oncoming generation. Clearly, in order to protect the families properly, it is necessary to see to it that the mothers are provided with additional sums according to the number of children they have. But if this were made a burden upon industry, the natural consequence would seem to be that the employers would discharge first those who had several children to support, and to whom they consequently would have to pay appreciably more than the general average. These men would therefore tend to be unemployed, with the result that their families would be in a worse situation than before. But this difficulty can in reality be overcome in either one of two ways. Either the allowances for the children can be paid by the state from funds raised through taxation, or they can be made a charge upon a group of employers and distributed in such a way as to prevent any inducement to discriminate against giving employment to men with families. The former method is best illustrated by the recent New Zealand act which makes a grant from the state funds of approximately $2 a month for every child beyond the second whose parents do not have an average weekly income of $19.50. The French *caisses de compensation* and the 1927 law of New South Wales illustrate two forms of the latter method. Thus in France, there are now over 210 such funds, joining together in voluntary union more than 14,000 employers who employ more than a million and four hundred thousand wage-earners. Here the allowances paid by the concerns who are members of a *caisse* are charged against the members as a whole. They in turn pay their contributions according to several bases such as (1) the relative number of workers employed; (2) the relative number of man-hours worked; (3) the relative amount paid out in wages. Thus if a fund which included two hundred firms and 100,000 workers were to pay allowances for 120,000 children, of $200 each, the total charge would be 24 million dollars. If this were divided according to the numbers employed, the assessment per worker would amount to $240. The employer would pay this amount for the bachelor as well as for the man with eight children, and hence would have no inducement to discriminate in favor of the former.

The payment of these allowances and membership in the funds is voluntary in France, but an act by the Parliament of New South Wales which was passed in March of this year makes them obligatory and universal in that state. Weekly payments of 5 shillings for each child are made from the state funds to all families, whether wage earners or self-employed, whose incomes do not exceed that of the basic wage. This is in turn set at the cost of maintaining

man and wife and not, as formerly, a family of four. To help meet the cost of paying these allowances to the wage-earners, the employees are required to pay a given percentage of their wages bill, at present 3 per cent, to this central state fund. The act covers approximately 400,000 children and it is estimated that it will entail an annual expenditure of approximately 25 million dollars.

It is only through some such system as this that our modern family can be protected by industry. Any such proposal, however, naturally encounters opposition from many sources, of which the two following are the most important: (1) Those who fear that it would cause a great increase in population. Such critics point to what they suppose was to the effect of the Spenheemland system of poor relief in England, which made grants according to the number of dependents, although recent studies have shown that the application of the Spenheemland system was followed by a decline in the birthrate, and not by the increase which Malthus and Ricardo fancied that they observed. The rise in living standards which such payments would cause would set into play forces limiting births, and if this were not sufficient, then the allowances for children beyond say the third or fourth could be diminished.

(2) A second group of opponents are those who fear that it would be used to depress the wages of the single men, and to weaken the position of the unions. That the single men at present have a surplus above the level of their class is undeniable, so that if the existing total wages-bill were to be rationed according to need, then their surplus should be distributed among the families with dependents. If such allowances were paid by the state, it would probably result in those who receive them offering their services at a somewhat lower base rate than before, and hence would deflate the wages of the unmarried males. If such allowances were to be installed almost simultaneously by industry as a whole, it would be possible to pay most, if not all, of the allowances by a reduction in the base rate or, as in France, by not increasing the base rate as rapidly as the advance in living costs. If it were introduced gradually, however, it would be impossible for an industry appreciably to reduce the wages of single men, lest they should go elsewhere and leave the employers with an undue ratio of dependents to workers. Since this system will probably only spread in America by gradual degrees, this fear is not well grounded. Unions, moreover, may by incorporating such provisions in their collective agreements at once secure joint control of the system and prevent the money wages of the bachelors from being reduced.

It is indisputable, however, that even though such payments do not decrease the actual money sums going to bachelors, they will result in a different distribution of funds as between those who have and those who do not have dependents from what would otherwise be the case. But this is as it should be. There is need not only for changes in the vertical distribution of income as between rich and poor but also for changes in the horizontal distribution as between those who have children to support and bachelors and childless couples. Socialists and labor sympathizers have been reluctant to admit the necessity for this second type of change lest it impair the solidarity of the working class, but from a human point of view it also is necessary. Such a system of family allowances, particularly if paid to the mother in the home and not to the father in the workshop, would go far to enable the family as a consuming unit to meet the economic strains which the separation of production from the household has brought upon it.

TOWARD THE REDISCOVERY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN INDUSTRY[1]

DAVID C. ADIE
General Secretary, Buffalo Charity Organization Society

ELLIOTT Dunlap Smith, discussing industry, says that some of the fundamental desires of the individual are self-support, including the support of one's family; self-respect, including the respect and emulation of others; self-expression; justice.

In spite of the fact that the first characteristic of modern industry is the exceedingly complicated and highly organized productive machine, it ought to be possible to emphasize these very elementary aspirations on the part of the individual. The industrial problem in its present form is not only relatively new but has not been subjected to a process of analysis that can be said to have produced a very great understanding of the inter-related factors. There exists abundant data on the elements of production, distribution, and other factors which enter into the material and organizational aspects of industry. When it comes to the human equation we find ourselves confused because consideration is usually carried on within a conflict area. We have not yet come to the place where we see industry apart from the fruits of labor.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the greatest necessity in this industrial tangle is to secure objective consideration on the basis of an approach via the scientific method, uninfluenced by our individual circumstances. It may be questioned whether industry has not achieved a condition of too great isolation. We sometimes are given to understand that industrial questions lie in a separate compartment of life and must be judged by a standard different from that which we apply to other problems in our civilization. Some consider it sacrilegious to think that industry must relegate itself to a secondary position in the life of man. The life of man is concerned with all the individual and social aspects of his civilization. We do not live only that we may provide self-support for ourselves and families but also that we may participate in the amenities of our civilization. Industry does not and cannot exist as something apart from life. It exists to supply human wants and to extend the area of civilization. It does not exist primarily to increase material wealth. The sooner it is recognized as only a part of the national fabric the sooner shall we be able to relate its practices and effects to the general welfare. Furthermore, it is only when we see the relatedness of this aspect of life to that of the general life of the community that we shall be in a position to eliminate the conflict area. Expressed in the words of D. L. Hoopingarner, "The most practical thing that industry needs today is an industrial philosophy that is human and, being human, is most efficient."

Sometimes we fail to realize how rapidly the machine has developed. When these United States were organized, the industrial revolution still belonged to the future. James Watt perfected his "improved steam engine" in 1781 and at that time industrial relations were stratified into master workmen, journeymen, and apprentices. Commerce and merchandising were similarly in a simple and undeveloped state. Life, at however low a standard, was relatively simple. This vast, complicated, industrial, commercial, and financial organism that towers above us today has been developed within the time-span of our life as an organized nation. The American Revolution was culminated in an era of small shops and home manufacture. In contrast to this we find, in a volume entitled *Modern Business* by Marshall and Wiese, the following estimate of the present day situation: "As time goes on, more and more of our manufacturing is done in large establishments; the figures for 1921 show that less than 3 per cent of our plants turned out 59 per cent of the total product. . . . About 20 per cent of our plants turned out 90 per cent of our total product. . . . Clearly large scale production is a significant feature of our industry." It is estimated that in 1921, 250,666 plants employed 6,946,570 workers. Less than 7 per cent of these plants employ

[1] Given Wednesday morning, October 5, 1927.

slightly less than 66 per cent of the workers. It is also significant that in each of the plants included in this 7 per cent there were more than 500 workers employed. Involved in this, of course, is the great loss of skill on the part of the individual craftsman and his divorce from consideration and association with the complete scheme of production. Naturally in such extensive plant organization the thought, planning, and skill necessary to operation has had to be transferred from the individual to the management, involving as it must records, system, control devices, and so on. The lack of such devices would produce chaos. It is partly because of the rapidity of development and the necessity for being concerned with the mechanical and productive aspects of industry that we have witnessed the undeveloped condition that marks the consideration of the human factors. We suffer in all departments of thought from the undue influence of a production philosophy because during this rapid development we have been chiefly concerned, as a people, with the materialistic aspects of civilization. Even a casual acquaintance with the literature surrounding the early days of the development of the Taylor system of industrial efficiency must shock the reader because of the utter lack of consideration given to human rights and needs. The development of an automatic machine age has produced this condition, but it has also raised the material standards of life. It has made possible the extension of a standard of life that was beyond the concept of the leaders of former eras. Society has gained in increased wealth, variety, quantity, and cheapness of production and the enlargement of many opportunities.

With this has come a variety of disadvantages. Individualism produced duplication and waste and the rapid rise of the industrial machine has been characterized by poor co-ordination and a varying degree of exploitation. The employer has been involved in extensive financial risks while the worker has been dependent on a wage system with no voice or part in the ownership and control of the industrial process. He has been compelled to live in competition with his fellows; has been limited in the opportunity for promotion; has been robbed of self-expression; suffers from periodic unemployment; has been detached from the entire process of manufacturing. In general, he has found himself involved in a social inferiority. The individual has become immersed within the industrial mechanism, whether he belongs to the employing or employed group. He bends to the influence of a machine age. It is becoming increasingly necessary that man shall either master this machine or be enslaved to it. If he will master it, and he must do this because he cannot escape it, it becomes necessary that he shall understand it in every detail. If the attempt to understand it produces only a consideration of the material factors involved, to the elimination of the human equation, he will find in reality that he is still in the position of bondage.

The social organism is plastic and nothing is as changeless as change. It is questionable whether man has ever been able effectively to secure new conditions of life by overthrowing a social system. Rather do we find that the process has been one of evolution in which disintegration from the center to the circumference was involved. For instance, the guild system involving the simple relationship of master, journeyman worker, and apprentice was not so effectively assaulted from the outside as from within. The concentration by a gradual process of a sufficient number of the guild units into the hands of more powerful individuals tended to the development of larger concerns, and the elimination of the journeyman worker from his strategic position from which ordinarily he graduated to the place of ownership. When we add to this the growing cost and complexity of machinery and the necessity of developing national and international markets and finance, we see man arriving at the time when simple relationships within industry inevitably disappear and with this condition comes the submerging of the individual. It is impossible for the ordinary student of social affairs to refrain from challenging the present condition. It is impossible in particular for those concerned with family life to assume that the family and all other social institutions must, whether it is desirable or not, adjust themselves to the demands and commands of one creature of our civilization.

It is just here that those of us concerned

with the welfare of the family structure demand that reconsideration be given to the amenities of life and that the emphasis shall be placed upon life as a whole and not upon sections of living. Discussing human relations, Taylor and Brown say, "There are two vital concepts essential to an understanding and appreciation. One is that the day-by-day life of every individual is in every way but a part of the day-by-day life of the group of which he is a member. The other is that ethics, whether called 'public ethics' or not, constitutes standards of conduct set by groups. Righteousness inheres in right human relationship and unrighteousness inheres in wrong human relationship." "If the responsibility of participation is not accepted by the citizens, democracy loses its capacity to guarantee the integrity of wholesome, individual life. For such integrity and such wholesomeness can be assured only by the creative function which the individual performs by participation."

It is inevitable then that the social worker viewing industry desires to see those conditions obtain which will enable those engaged in industry to seek and find their fullest expression through participation in supplying human wants and the advancement of our civilization. To view business from the point of view of profit, from the amount rather than the nature of the product, to see labor as a mere commodity, bartered about in an area of conflict, is to admit of a situation that is not to public advantage.

Efficient administration of labor relationships depends upon the clearness with which we see economic conditions and possibilities on the one hand and human factors on the other. The individual in industry may not be able clearly to define his position but surely such a definition would involve a better status in life; a greater share in the responsibility of the business enterprise itself through the development of a wider participation in the creation of the policies that surround hours, conditions of work and the individual share in the product. The individual lives, in the last analysis, in certain well-defined areas. These may be described as the areas of economics, health, education, leisure, culture, and the spiritual. To the extent to which the individual can adequately function in these areas, he is free. The management group suffers greatly under the pressure of business. Its members are not free from the wear and tear involved in this aspect of life but they are more free in the sense that they can more readily engage their interests in forms of life and living that offset the detrimental effects of the day-by-day struggle in the industrial field. This may be brought home to us by some figures presented by the National Bureau of Economic Research. In 1913, the average earnings of the factory employee in the U. S. were $705. In 1918, they were $1148. If these figures are reduced to dollars of constant purchasing power based on the 1913 price level, they become $705 in 1913 and $726 in 1918.

These figures, it seems to me, make clear the fact that the majority of our people engaged in industrial pursuits must find it increasingly difficult to escape from the pressure of the economic area into other areas which would provide for self-development and release. The average worker has had neither time nor resources to do much more than secure a mere living from an impersonal environment.

It is becoming apparent that the discussion of the subject is being clouded by traditional emotion arising out of conditions no longer current factors in industry. It is also apparent that no very satisfactory discussion can follow the general blanket-like policy that has prevailed. Nor can we continue to discuss blindly, in a merely repetitious manner, aspects which have been handed around from one theorist to another. For instance, nearly every person dissatisfied with industrial relations lays enormous emphasis on the question of monotony. One cannot discuss industry purely from a production point of view, neither do I think we can determine the reaction of the individual worker to his job merely by a study of a particular factor in the industrial process. Non-industrial organizations seem to suffer from most of the ills which we deplore in the business world. So far as I am able to observe, many teachers are bored and discontented with their condition and I have a very strong suspicion that the same thing holds true of many of our social workers, yet there are surely few positions that allow more definitely for the expression of the

creative instinct than do these two types of work. Why then should we find that routine governs and restricts the individual in these vocations? Is it not because of the individual himself? Is it not true that discontent with one's job may very definitely involve discontent with oneself? I am not maintaining that monotony does not have a very definite relationship to the individual. It would seem that fatigue is often confused with monotony and that many of the conditions we observe are due to the former rather than the latter. I question very much whether the worker is half as conscious of the so-called effects of monotony as are those who speculate on the subject. There can be no question that specialization, fatigue, and monotony dull the mental life and thereby affect the social group—which is the world in which the individual finds himself. Retardation is thus involved within the industrial process itself. In spite of this, however, we are charging against windmills when we seek to confine our consideration of this aspect of the problem only within the industrial realm. Modification of industrial processes and conditions can never eliminate the necessity of establishing contact between the individual and the communal resources which will provide the necessary avenues of compensation and release. This may involve a complete reconsideration of our recreational, cultural, and allied facilities within the community. It may even involve a complete restatement of accepted standards and values within these areas of activity.

I have no reason to believe that the position of the individual in the simple industrial organism that preceded the present form was devoid of drab existence. The opportunity for a varied expression of life is certainly infinitely greater today than it was in the 18th century. I think that we suffer in this respect from a tendency to romance and to traffic in golden ages. We must be realists enough to conceive that one cannot possibly expect to escape the vehicle of production. The fault lies rather in the fact that the mine, the factory, and the warehouse have been divorced in our mind from the community. They are no more separate entities than are our schools, churches, parks, roads, and theaters. It is the same worker spending 8 or 10 hours in the factory who comes back to the community and the family. His life is governed to as great an extent by the intimate affairs of his family and communal relationships as by his industrial condition. I am not pleading for a policy of hands-off in industry. I am simply emphasizing the fact that there are many aspects of monotony that lie outside the realm of business. Indeed, I question whether the monotony experienced by a worker at a machine is greater than that felt by the average housewife with her never-ending routine, carried forward in a drab community with definitely restricted opportunities for entertainment and pleasure. The daily round and common task in a household limited economically, crushed by a gray environment, and affected by the large element of chance, is oppressive. The wear and tear of the intimate affairs of family life are, in my opinion, more corrosive than the experiences of the man in the factory. All of us will recognize that merely going out into the world, with the opportunity to talk sports, politics, shop conditions, and manifold other questions, far exceeds in interest the sphere which is occupied by the average housewife.

We are engaged in a great waste of energy if we attempt a solution within the industrial organism instead of viewing the possibility of individual development so that an escape can be effected into other areas of living. The experiences of Denmark and elsewhere of the beneficial effects of a comprehensive and intelligent system of adult education—well-rounded and varied in its aspects—must not be lost sight of. The dynamic influences thus brought into the life of the individual, especially during the years between 18 and 25, have enormous possibilities of enlarging and enriching the individual life. Rigid life patterns produced through repetitious industrial processes can thus be at least partially off-set and the individual enabled more satisfactorily to secure his own adjustments within his environment through widening and extending interest zones.

Mr. S. A. Lewisohn has stated this very concretely:

> What the worker wants will depend on the particular situation. The one broad answer most use-

ful in the present instance is that it is the responsibility of every production executive to study his particular situation and to create conditions that will bring about the best local adjustment. It is sometimes useful to make a purely tentative classification as a frame work for discussion. If, in this spirit, I should summarize, in broad terms, certain general concepts that should guide an executive in dealing with his workers, I should roughly classify the more important desires of the workmen as, first, the desire for justice; second, the desire for status; and third, the desire to have his job made a career.

In spite of all that can be said with reference to the difficulties inherent in the industrial situation; in spite of all the limitations relating to the opportunity of the individual, in spite of all the materialism that governs our communities today, it is my contention that we are only making matters worse by our present policy of general fulmination. In some respects, poverty can be considered as a general social condition. Have we not learned that the approach is more successfully made in the individual community through the individual family than by any other method? The application of an "ism" may be broad in its effect but it will fail in meeting the specific problems involved in a variety of situations. No one has any broad generalization as to one cause of poverty. We see the existence of a great variety of co-determining factors. Is there not some analogy between this and the industrial situation? Is the position of the individual to be enhanced by some rule-of-thumb method, or by the sympathetic study of a specific situation? While it may be a general statement, I believe it is true that the industrial conditions in a plant will reflect the social-mindedness of the executive to a greater degree than we have been willing to admit. Admitting frankly the chaotic conditions that obtain and the fact that the acquisitive habit and desire for power are producing difficulty for the individual in industry, is it not also true that the very fierceness with which some of us have spoken about injustice has had the effect of solidifying positions and class consciousness? General statements like "the undependability of the worker" or "the avaricious nature of the employer" are not very helpful in securing a solution of the problem. Too much time has been spent in drawing the line of battle and too little time has been given to securing a sympathetic understanding between the managerial group on the one hand and the employed group on the other. The trial and error method that is being attempted in many of the businesses will be of great advantage. The outcome of the experiments in labor management now being carried forward in the several branches of the clothing industry, the printing industry, and the B. & O. Railroad, to cite but a few, contain more hope, in my opinion, than most of the blanket schemes for reform. Industrial relations are not always governed by what appears on the surface.

I see no possibility of there being any change for the better in industrial relations unless plans are developed along lines similar to what is generally known as the "case work method." Indeed I am coming to believe that this is true with reference to all departments of life and living.

A study of the actual situation would improve much of the legislation that goes through our legislatures. It is conceivable that an educational institution should build its curriculum in a haphazard manner, but it leads to chaos when a community carries forward its government in a piecemeal fashion, and it is most certainly true that most of the problems that affect the individual in industry are due to the fact that we have created a conflict area in which no real thought is being given to the particular aspects of a localized problem. If industry is going to remain isolated from the rest of life; if it is going to be governed purely from the point of view of production; if the personnel departments are merely efficiency bureaus; and if we are not going to appreciate the criss-cross of life, with all its complicated emotionalism, we shall not accomplish very much. If, on the other hand, the business executive can think in terms of the human factor as well as the raw materials of production; if in our large organized units of industry it can be as much a matter of pride to secure the welfare of the worker as quantity of product; if there can be brought home to all parties concerned some simple concept of the interplay of home life, community conditions, and economic status of the individual, we may rationally expect to see a development

toward more stable relationships and real freedom. If we are dominated by a philosophy of merely standing guard over material gains we will inevitably intensify and enlarge the conflict. If, through patience and understanding, we can bring ourselves to a study of the human equation in industry we shall, in all probability, not only discover a few general principles which can be universally applied, but shall also learn the art of corporate living.

The present policy most certainly is not showing any hope of rediscovering the individual. It is leading to an ever-widening area of complication. It is affecting the very innermost parts of our social being. We must recognize in industry as in every other phase of life that the feelings, motives, and aspirations of one individual are pretty much the same as those experienced by another, and that the mental processes in a broad sense are fundamentally the same in most normal people. Intelligent development of personnel departments, a wider social sense on the part of executive and foreman, and a similar development on the part of the individual worker will do more to produce a satisfactory working relationship than general schemes of reform.

I hope no one will assume that this means the abandonment of organization either on the part of the employer or the worker. One cannot very easily see the life of the modern world carried on apart from mass organization. Trade unions and employers' associations are basically meeting legitimate group needs and can be expected to play a larger rather than a smaller part in our community life. In the last analysis, however, it is the leadership of these institutions expressed through understanding men and women, motivated by a high idealism and concerned with the application of intelligence and sympathy, that will enable us to find satisfactory adjustment in our industrial relationship. Nothing possesses value apart from living beings. Industry must not only meet the economic wants but it must meet them in such a manner and under such conditions as will recognize the interplay of other social institutions and modes of association. Industry, for example, has economic and social reasons for assisting in maintaining a high character of family life in all aspects. It must sense this even to so great an extent as to cause executives and foremen to be aware of the seemingly small but nevertheless tremendous situations which characterize the day-by-day life of the individual within the family. For instance, the effect on production, satisfaction with the job, or even freedom from accident on the part of the individual worker in the shop is definitely related to sickness in the home, the delinquency of children, misunderstanding between husband and wife, and a host of other disturbing influences. Is it too much to expect that the day will arrive when these factors will be considered in the plant just as definitely as the production quota? Industry must also come to realize that understanding, sympathy, and altruism are very definite characteristics with real social significance. The misapplication of these leads to paternalism. The right application will assist in developing the conditions conducive to the best interests of all parties concerned, and in addition, provide the worker with the opportunity, through his own direction and efforts, to secure the things which he may reasonably expect. These are not mere matters of economics, but involve a wellrounded life of economic stability, physical vigor, and the finer things of a cultural and spiritual life.

BOOK REVIEWS

FAMILY DISORGANIZATION: Ernest R. Mowrer. University of Chicago Press, 1927. 317 pp.

This book by one of the University of Chicago group (whose steady "drawing nigh" to an understanding of the possible paths of mutual helpfulness of the sociologist and the social case worker has been watched with keen interest by both groups) should be in all our libraries for what it is and for what it promises for the future. It will take its place as one of the earliest efforts in a "systematic study of the modern family."

As Dr. Burgess states in his introduction:

> Its purpose was to make a systematic survey of the methods of research now in use in the investigation of the problems of the modern family. . . . This present volume does not undertake a complete analysis of modern family organization. But it has assembled and tested the tools of research requisite for the task. It has, indeed, gone further and presented samples of products from the use of these various techniques. These exhibits of family disorganization in its different aspects—comparative statistics of divorce for the United States and foreign countries, and for rural and urban areas, the distribution of divorce and desertion by local communities in a metropolitan city, family disorganization in relation to the social forces of modern life, the analysis by family tensions and behavior sequences of individual cases of family disintegration—taken together give the reader an appreciation of the factors and forces affecting the family under modern conditions.

The first chapters of the book, on statistical interpretation, are an almost deadly revelation of the fallacious reasoning in many so-called statistics on family disintegration. Dr. Mowrer has gone behind the returns, examined the records of divorces granted, and shown how the legal reasons for divorce vary so tremendously from the actual. He has demolished that child-like faith which some have had that, given an analysis of the causes behind absolute disintegration grouped statistically, you had presented the lines to be followed in constructively combating all family disintegration.

> While trends may be determined and comparisons made, no description or explanation of the processes of family disorganization are possible so long as the data subjected to statistical treatment are those having to do with the events of common sense, *e.g.*, divorce and desertion. For such statistics are always limited to external traits in the behavior of individuals which are susceptible to enumeration or measurement. As such they do not deal directly with the phenomenon of the interaction of personalities in marriage. And the description and explanation of this interplay of attitudes between husband and wife, and between parents and children, is the chief objective of sociological research upon the family.

While this "Ecology of Family Life" (page 110 *et seq.*) as a first venture may be somewhat roughly hewn, it is not only suggestive as to the subject under consideration but it also offers social workers a starting point for a really thoughtful approach to neighborhood influences. Outside of nationality groups the "local community" has been little studied in its relation to its influence upon family life as is shown by the reading of many records in all parts of the country. We have even no nomenclature descriptive of different kinds of neighborhoods. Dr. Mowrer has given us certain initial data for this.

In his discussion of social forces and changing social forces he concludes,

> For purposes of control, then, it is necessary to think of social forces as somehow objectively embodied in the behavior of persons. Research into the processes by which attitudes are developed in the experience of persons in their marriage relations offers more adequate descriptions of social forces than the charting of historical tendencies.

The chapters devoted to the case study approach should be stimulating and challenging to social case workers. We will all of us dissent at points. Dr. Mowrer is critical of case work achievement though he does recognize its goals. We know that there is in existence better material, even in the shape of records, than he has so far found. The best material which he uses does not come from case records but is otherwise obtained. One study from an unpublished manuscript is included "because it presents a departure in interpretation from the static conception of family disorganization in terms of typical discord situations to a dynamic conception in which several discord situations are linked together in a sequence." There are case records in existence which reveal similar dynamic qualities. Certainly there will be staunch objection to this:

> Desertion cases are looked upon as hopeless by the average social worker. She is likely to see in the situation little more than the financial problem created by the desertion.

All thorough-going case workers will likewise discovery in the diary of Miriam Donaven, embodied in Chapter XI, possibly glaring misinterpretations which could only be revealed by the presentation of evidence which is not here given.

Nevertheless, there is so much that is finely and constructively suggestive in these later chapters that they ought to become part of the usual reading not only of staff members but of committee and board members. There is so much more of weakness in our work than in this book! While, as we said before, it does recognize the goals of case work, it does render us service in severely

and frequently calling upon us to see what we are actually doing; as, for example:

> So far, however, social workers have failed, for the most part, to utilize even those principles of human behavior which have been adequately demonstrated.

We believe that could be truthfully moderated but still we need the challenge and the repeated challenge.

We have been discussing so far the book from the point of view of the social case work agency. We ought not to conclude without commending it as one which is well worth while for any person who is intelligently interested in meeting the problems of the family upon a somewhat higher plane than the flamboyance of those who make large statements upon the basis of their own prejudices and simple beliefs, buttressed by some naïve statistics which fit into the previously wrought pattern.

FRANCIS H. MCLEAN

—

THE FAMILY SOCIETY: JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES OF BOARD, STAFF, AND MEMBERSHIP: Francis H. McLean. American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, New York, 1927, 148 pp.

This little book of Mr. McLean's may be viewed from two quite different positions, that of social workers and that of sociologists.

As social workers we welcome it for its convenient summing up of the experience of many persons and agencies in the field of family service. We are glad to read it through for the sake of a certain perspective which it yields. We want to check ourselves and our society against its list of recommended arrangements and procedures. We keep it nearby for ready reference when faced by some new problem of intra- or inter-agency relationships.

But with all its merits the book has some lacks which we hope may be supplied in a later publication. We would like to have more concrete materials showing how some of the conclusions were reached. Especially for teaching purposes—teaching of board members, staff, volunteers, or "students"—a very helpful plan would be to present first a given problem, then some specific instances showing what may be involved in such a problem, then examples of ways in which the problem has been met or bungled; finally there would be a place for the author's own conclusions.

This same comment is offered by the sociologists. As students of this growing science we are interested in types of group organization, group activities and inter-group relations. To us the family welfare society is primarily a sample of a species which we variously label "voluntary, purposive group" or "accommodation group." As such we are eager to know about its structure—who makes up the group and what are their relations to each other? We want to know about its origins—to what demands is it a response and how does it come into being? We ask what are its functions—what present purposes does it serve and how are its tasks marked off from those of other groups? Or we may think of the family welfare society less as a group of persons and more as an impersonal "institution" or "culture complex." But we still seek to discover its nature, origin, and function. Now Mr. McLean's book sheds real light on all these questions, but the inclusion of more "case materials" would have added greatly to its usefulness for the sociologist.

To the persons who are not only social workers or sociologists, but are also concerned about possible co-operation between the two groups, another comment will occur. It is that this book is the summing up (and a very effective summing up, too) of empirical generalizations. It appears to be based on no particular sociological theory nor to produce one. The significance of this comment is not that the author has failed in his task, but that apparently sociology has not yet produced any theory around which such a book might be built and that it will take more than this kind of a book to produce the theory. In order that such a general theory may be developed it seems necessary that social workers and sociologists co-operate in the objective study of just what happens in many different groups such as family welfare societies. After a period of joint observing, recording, classifying, and interpreting, there may emerge generalizations of such widespread validity that they can form the basis for revising social work methods. Then, and only then, will there be possible an "applied sociology."

STUART A. QUEEN
University of Kansas

BOOKS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

APPROACH TO PUBLIC WELFARE AND SOCIAL WORK: Howard W. Odum. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1926, 178 pp.

AUSBILDUNG ZUM SOZIALEN BERUF: Dr. Alice Salomon. Carl Heymanns, Berlin, 1927.

BABY'S DAILY EXERCISES: Dr. Edward T. Wilkes. Appleton, N. Y., 1927, 77 pp.

CARE OF THE AGED IN CHICAGO: Elizabeth A. Hughes and Elsie Wolcott Hayden. Dept. Public Welfare, Chicago, 1927.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU OF CLEVELAND. A Study of the Care of Dependent Children. U. S. Dept. Labor, Publication No. 177. 98 pp.

CO-OPERATIVE MOVEMENT IN SOCIAL WORK: Wm. J. Norton. Macmillan, N. Y., 1927, 373 pp.

COURTS AND THE PREVENTION OF DELINQUENCY: Proceedings, Nat. Probation Ass'n, N. Y., 1926, 282 pp.

DOES PROHIBITION WORK? Martha Bensley Bruere. Harper, N. Y., 1927, 329 pp.

EMPLOYMENT FOR THE HANDICAPPED: Selected Bibliography, Russell Sage Library, N. Y., August, 1927, 4 pp.

FOURTEEN IS TOO EARLY: Raymond G. Fuller. Nat. Child Labor Committee, N. Y., 1927, 40 pp.

GREAT COMPANIONS: Readings on the Meaning and Conduct of Life from Ancient and Modern Sources. Compiled by Robert French Leavens. Beacon Press, Boston, 1927, 678 pp.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION: Roy L. Garis. Macmillan, N. Y., 1927, 376 pp.

JUVENILE COURTS IN THE U. S., THEIR LAW AND PRACTICE: Herbert H. Low. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1927, 277 pp.

JUVENILE DETENTION HOME IN RELATION TO JUVENILE COURT POLICY: Savilla Millis. University of Chicago, 96 pp.

MOTHER AND UNBORN CHILD: Samuel Raynor Meaker. Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore, 1927, 209 pp.

NATIONALITY, COLOR, AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY IN THE CITY OF BUFFALO: Niles Carpenter. The Inquiry, New York, 194 pp.

MEDICAL CARE FOR A MILLION PEOPLE. Committee on Dispensary Development, N. Y., 1927, 90 pp.

POORHOUSE SWEENEY: Ed Sweeney. Boni & Liveright, N. Y., 1927, 178 pp.

PUBLIC WELFARE ADMINISTRATION: Sophonisba P. Breckinridge. University of Chicago Press, 1927, 789 pp.

ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL: Annual Report of the Social Work Dept., 1926. St. Thomas's Hospital, London, S. E. 1, 71 pp.

SELECTED LIST OF BOOKS FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS: Supplement, 1927. Child Study Association, N. Y., 26 pp.

SELECTED REFERENCES ON MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS: Donald Young. Central Bureau of Phila. Yearly Meeting of Friends, Phila., 1927, 20 pp.

SEX EDUCATION. Child Study Ass'n, N. Y., 1927, 22 pp.

SHOULD WE BE VACCINATED? Bernhard J. Stern. Harper, N. Y., 1927, 146 pp.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE BUSINESS CYCLE: Dorothy Swaine Thomas. Knopf, N. Y., 1927, 217 pp.

SOCIAL BASIS OF CONSCIOUSNESS: Trigant Burrow. Harcourt, Brace, N. Y., 1927, 256 pp.

SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION: C. C. North. University of North Carolina Press, 1926, 343 pp.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND EDUCATION: Ernest R. Groves. Longmans Green, N. Y., 1925, 458 pp.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF THE FAMILY: Ernest R. Groves. Lippincott, Phila., 1927, 314 pp.

SOCIAL WORK PUBLICITY: Charles C. Stillman. Century, N. Y., 1927, 254 pp.

STUDY OF DELINQUENT AND NEGLECTED NEGRO CHILDREN. Joint Committee on Negro Child Study, N. Y., 1927, 48 pp.

SUCCESSFUL FAMILY LIFE ON THE MODERATE INCOME: Mary Hinman Abel. Lippincott, Phila., 1927, 253 pp.

STUDY OF DIVORCE AND ITS CAUSATION IN DOUGLAS CO., NEB.: T. Earl Sullenger. Univ. of Omaha Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 2, March, 1927, 15 pp.

VILLAGE COMMUNITIES: Edmund deS. Brunner. Doran, N. Y., 1927, 244 pp.

The Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work

Graduate Training

For

Community Social Work

Social Case Work

and

Public Health Nursing

311 SOUTH JUNIPER STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Buy Christmas Seals **Fight tuberculosis**